

Library Pacific Jan 25
School of Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

VOLUME 33—No. 12

DECEMBER, 1927

*Continues The Sermonizer, Student and Teacher, Preacher's Assistant,
Preacher's Magazine, and Preacher's Illustrator*

THE BIBLE CHAMPION

Official Organ of the Bible League of North America

ESTABLISHED IN 1889

Frank J. Boyer, Managing Editor and Publisher

Associate Editors—Leander S. Keyser, D.D.
Philip Mauro A.Z. Conrad, D.D.

David S. Kennedy, D.D.
Harold Paul Sloan, D.D.,

Contributing Editors—Dyson Hague, D.D., Wm. Phillips Hall, Wm. M. McPheeters, D.D.
Walter Duncan Buchanan, D.D., LL.D., John Roach Straton, D.D. W.B. Riley, D.D.,
George Boddie, D.D., A. Wm. Lewis, D.D., H. W. Bromley, D.D. Charles Roads, D.D.
Bishop William F. Heil, D.D., L. Franklin Gruber, D.D., LL.D., W. E. Biederwolf, D.D.
Charles Calvert Ellis, Ph.D., D.D., J. L. Dickens, D.D., LL.D., J. A. Huffman, A. B., D.D.
T. C. Horton, D.D., C. H. Buchanan, D.D., Percy G. Cross, D.D., James W. Countermine, D.D.

Accepting the Plain Intent of Scripture

LUTHER'S doctrine of the right of private judgment is not that every one is at liberty to pass what judgment he pleases with respect to spiritual things. There is a fixed and unerring norm which the private Christian is under obligation to follow, as any judge is restrained from arbitrary verdicts by the law that he is sworn to administer.

Says Luther: "Such judging of doctrine must not be according to our own thoughts, or from one's own wisdom, but there must be a fixed, clear rule, according to which to judge; and such a rule is the word of Christ. This alone is the norm and test, as we have often said."—From *Jacobs' Martin Luther*.

FRANK J. BOYER, PUBLISHER, READING, PA.

Price \$2.00 the Year

Canada \$2.25, Foreign \$2.35

Single Copy 20 Cents

Entered as Second-class matter, at the Post Office, Reading, Pa., under act of March 3, 1897

"In the Name of Our God We Will Set Up Our Banners"

Who will send us \$1.00 to send *The Champion* to 3 persons, each 3 months? Will **you** help to that extent?

CONTENTS—DECEMBER, 1927

EDITORIAL

Of Interest to our Subscribers— <i>Frank J. Boyer</i>	605
The Birth of Jesus Christ— <i>David S. Kennedy, D.D.</i>	606
Some of Dr. Cadman's Departures— <i>Leander S. Keyser, D.D.</i>	607
The Advocates are as Vocal as Ever— <i>Leander S. Keyser, D.D.</i>	609
More Reasons for Watchfulness— <i>Frank J. Boyer</i>	611
Some Random Thoughts on Evolution— <i>Leander S. Keyser, D.D.</i>	612
God Manifest in the Flesh— <i>David S. Kennedy, D.D.</i>	614
A Sample of Behaviorism— <i>Leander S. Keyser, D.D.</i>	615
Notes and Comments.....	616

THE ARENA

Joseph McCabe's Materialism— <i>Reverend William Schoeler</i>	624
A Symposium on Evolution— <i>J. A. O. Stub, D.D., Judge Sterling P. King, J. M. Stanfield, Professor Theodore Graebner, Victor I. Masters, D.D., William E. Biedewolf, D.D., Arthur I. Brown, M.D., Byron C. Nelson, D.D., Professor R. A. Meek, D.D.</i>	637
The Story of the Nativity— <i>Herbert W. Magoun, Ph.D.</i>	642

PRAYER MEETING SERVICE— <i>A. William Lewis, D.D.</i>	647
---	-----

OUR SERIAL

Jungle Poison— <i>Professor Glenn Gates Cole</i>	649
--	-----

THE LIBRARY TABLE— <i>Conducted by Professor Leander S. Keyser, A.M., D.D.</i>	655
--	-----

A List of Anti-Evolution Books.....	655
One-Man Bible Translations— <i>A. Z. Conrad, D.D.</i>	657
Reviews of Recent Books.....	658

Important Instructions: All mail should be addressed to, and all Money Orders and Drafts should be made payable to, Frank J. Boyer, Reading, Pa.

Change in Address—It is very important that Old as well as New address be given. Always allow at least 10 days to make a change.

Expiration and Renewals—Your subscription expires with the month and year printed on your Address Label. When renewing please state that your remittance is for a renewal. We receive new subscriptions by starting the magazine, and renewal subscriptions by changing your address label. A subscription blank enclosed in your magazine indicates your subscription has expired, and we earnestly solicit your prompt renewal.

Discontinuance—We find that many of our subscribers preferred not to have their subscription interrupted in case they fail to remit before expiration, therefore, by authority of the U. S. Postoffice Department, we can extend reasonable credit when necessary, and all subscribers are expected to notify us to stop magazine if it is no longer desired.

FRANK J. BOYER, Managing Editor and Publisher, Reading, Pa.

The Bible Champion



VOLUME 33

FROM JANUARY TO DECEMBER

1927

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Leander S. Keyser, D.D., David S. Kennedy, D.D.
Philip Mauro, Esq., A. Z. Conrad, D.D., Harold Paul Sloan, D.D.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

Dyson Hague, D.D.	Wm. Phillips Hall	Walter Duncan Buchanan, D.D., LL.D.
Wm. M. McPheeters, D.D.	W. B. Riley, D.D.	L. Franklin Gruber, D.D., LL.D.
A. Wm. Lewis, D.D.	H. W. Bromley, D.D.	W. E. Biederwolf, D.D.
John Roach Straton, D.D.	George Boddiss, D.D.	T. C. Horton.
Jas. W. Countermine, D.D.	J. L. Dickens, D.D., LL.D.	Charles Roads, D.D.
Charles Calvert Ellis, D.D.	Bishop William F. Heil, D.D.	J. A. Huffman, D.D.
C. H. Buchanan, D.D.	Percy George Cross, D.D.	

FRANK J. BOYER, *Managing Editor and Publisher*
READING, PENNSYLVANIA

The Bible Champion

Index to Volume 33

GENERAL INDEX

Arena, The.....	26,	Prayer Meeting Service, The.....	53,
84, 147, 202, 259, 337, 409, 454, 506, 559, 624		105, 166, 228, 291, 375, 431, 474, 530, 589, 647	
Editorial.....	1,	Reviews of Recent Books.....	61,
65, 125, 185, 245, 305, 397, 441, 485, 545, 605		119, 180, 238, 301, 389, 439, 481, 542, 602, 658	
Flashlights.....	51, 104, 230, 289, 373, 429, 472, 528, 587	Sanctuary, The.....	47,
Library Table, The.....	58,	101, 163, 225, 285, 369, 427, 470, 524, 585	
110, 172, 234, 295, 385, 436, 480, 537, 596, 655		Serial, Our.....	55,
Notes and Comments.....	18,	107, 168, 232, 293, 378, 433, 476, 532, 591, 649	
75, 137, 192, 250, 320, 402, 449, 500, 553, 616		Wayside Gleanings.....	24,
		81, 144, 199, 256, 333, 452, 503, 556	

AUTHORS

Akers, L. R.....	41	Horton, T. C.....	149, 422, 582
Bates, J. Warren.....	578	Huffman, J. A.....	268
Bates, William H.....	42,	Ingraham, Charles A.....	219
94, 160, 220, 283, 285, 366, 427, 454, 524		Ingram, A. F. W.....	586
Berg, J. Frederick.....	292	Johnson, Andrew.....	420
Blederwolf, William E.....	640	Jowett, John H.....	165
Boddis, George.....	202, 348, 559	Keister, Lawrence.....	32, 84, 151
Boyer, Frank J.....	1,	Kennedy, David S.....	9, 67, 74, 129,
13, 16, 24, 81, 144, 199, 256, 310, 313, 319,		187, 189, 305, 308, 312, 316, 397, 404, 444,	
333, 401, 448, 452, 493, 503, 551, 553, 556, 605, 611		447, 489, 490, 491, 496, 497, 546, 550, 606, 614	
Brewster, Edwin Tenney.....	357	Keyser, Leander S.....	2, 11, 16, 18, 58,
Brookes, J. H.....	57	61, 68, 72, 73, 75, 110, 119, 125, 126,	
Brooks, Phillips.....	365	120, 131, 132, 134, 137, 172, 180, 188, 191,	
Brown, Arthur I.....	640	192, 234, 238, 245, 246, 250, 274, 295, 301,	
Bryan, William J.....	41	306, 309, 311, 315, 318, 320, 355, 385, 389,	
Buchanan, C. H.....	266, 363, 506	398, 405, 436, 439, 446, 449, 479, 481, 486,	
Buckalew, Frank R.....	278	488, 492, 494, 498, 499, 500, 537, 542, 545,	
Burrell, David James.....	7,	553, 597, 602, 607, 609, 612, 615, 616, 655, 658	
17, 101, 133, 163, 225, 369, 513, 585		King, Sterling P.....	352, 637
Carson, J. F.....	224	Le Fevre, George N.....	38
Caswell, Edwin W.....	51,	Lewis, A. William.....	53, 105,
104, 228, 289, 373, 429, 472, 528, 587		166, 230, 291, 375, 431, 474, 530, 589, 647	
Clark, David S.....	571	McPheeters, W. M.....	552
Cole, Glen G.....	55,	Magoun, Herbert W.....	642
107, 168, 232, 293, 378, 433, 476, 532, 591, 649		Masters, Victor I.....	639
Conrad, A. Z.....	4,	Mauro, Philip.....	14, 65, 135, 248, 402, 441, 549, 552
15, 69, 127, 185, 247, 399, 445, 448, 547, 657		Meek, R. A.....	641
Davis, George T. B.....	215, 360	Moody, Dwight L.....	52
Dawson, W. J.....	586	Nelson, Byron C.....	640
Ellis, Charles C.....	100	Parker, Joseph.....	570
Erdman, Frederick.....	510	Pike, Clarence.....	460
Eve, A. S.....	150	Price, George McC.....	270, 358, 519
Flack, Elmer E.....	542	Rand, Josephine.....	583
Forde, L. Harold.....	457	Reid, John G.....	207
Franke, E. E.....	432	Riley, William B.....	147, 272, 347, 409
Frysinger, W. Maslin.....	300, 419	Roads, Charles.....	580
Furbay, James R.....	470	Roberts, C. Cullen.....	372
Gantz, Albert Dale.....	467	Robinson, William J.....	217
Gracey, H.....	90	Ross, Anna.....	465
Graebner, Theodore.....	638	Ross, Oliver L.....	158
Hague, Dyson.....	26	Schoeler, William.....	624
Haldeman, I. M.....	520	Scroggie, W. Graham.....	461
Hazard, Christopher G.....	45, 46, 418, 581, 584	Sharpe, Norvelle Wallace.....	209
Hall, William Phillips.....	3	Sloan, Paul Harold.....	485, 566
Hammer, El. W.....	177, 479	Smith, David.....	50
Heil, William H.....	206	Stanfield, J. M.....	638
Herman, Carl.....	425	Straton, John Roach.....	47, 573
Hoffman, John A.....	281, 577	Stub, J. A. O.....	263, 637
		Teckhaus, H. A.....	337

Index

Vos, Johannes G.	98	Winn, Thomas C.	423
Wakefield, Charles	115	Wuest, Kenneth S.	92
Wendt, August E.	515	Zelley, Henry J.	259
White, Hugh W.	579	Zerbe, Alvin S.	641
Whitney, D. J.	31, 276, 416, 466, 469		

THE ARENA

Address to the American Government.....	579	Leaves from a Minister's Note Book.....	84
Aeroplane View of the Heavens.....	515	Let them Know It.....	159
Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible.....	42, 94, 160, 220, 283, 366	Lines to the Primeval Cell.....	583
Answer to Anti-Christian Teaching.....	98	McCabe's Materialism	624
Are All Scientists Evolutionists?.....	202	Men and Dinosaurs.....	466
Are You Liked?.....	227	Miracle Book, The.....	461
Argument from Design, The.....	419	Misinformation about the Flood.....	519
As the Man is, so is his Strength.....	224	Mistaken Ideas about Bible Science.....	416
Book Nobody Knows, The.....	259	Mistakes.....	100
Can we still Trust the Bible?.....	577	Modernist Answered, A.....	566
Chatterton, Thomas, 1752-1770.....	90	Mourning the Dead.....	527
China's Nation-Wide Bible Campaign.....	215	Nature of Early Men, The.....	276
Choose and Stand By.....	513	Neolithic Period, The.....	475
Christ Bible, The.....	506	Next Phase of the Controversy, The.....	571
Christianity versus Evolution.....	363	Oriental Customs Substantiate Truth.....	423
Christ's Sepulchre.....	209	Outlook for Congregationalism, The.....	460
Debates on Evolution.....	206	Persecution and Revival in China.....	360
Defending Adam and Eve.....	586	Preeminence of Jesus Christ.....	217
Diagnosis of Modernism, A.....	467	Price versus Genesis.....	357
Did Jesus Christ Claim Sonship?.....	457	Remove not the Ancient Landmarks.....	219
Divine Reserve.....	419	Reply to Professor Brewster.....	358
Dogmatism of Scientists, The.....	266	Respect your Feelers.....	46
Don't you Want it to be True?.....	581	Roman Catholic Viewpoint, A.....	355
Do the Evidences Prove Evolution?.....	348	Satisfying Religion, A.....	100
Dualism and Monism in Psychology.....	337	Science of the Bible, The.....	278
Earmarks and Mistakes of Modernism.....	420	Secret of Comfort from God, The.....	365
Enthusiasm and Hope.....	292	See-Saw Religion and Somersault Theology.....	570
Evolution and Christ.....	559	Settled it Forty Years Ago.....	581
Evolution and Early Man.....	468	Similarities between Exodus and Apocalypse.....	510
Evolutionary Falsehoods Exposed.....	270	Solomon and Nebular Hypothesis.....	31
Evolution is Anti-Christian.....	147	Story of the Nativity, The.....	642
Evolution, On the Teaching of.....	263	Symposium on Evolution.....	637
Evolution Problem, The.....	158	They are Not Christians.....	346
Evolution; the School; the Church; the Law.....	352	True Beauty.....	165
Fishermen's Club, The.....	583	Unity of the Church, The.....	434
Five Reasons for Hope Within Me.....	92	Vicarious Shalls, The.....	26
God's Man.....	32	Virgin Birth, Two Objections to the.....	522
Half Truths and False Doctrines.....	565	Virgin Birth, The.....	520
Handicap an Opportunity, A.....	50	What are the Atheists Achieving?.....	425
Hang up the Receiver.....	43	What did Darwin Write?.....	150
Heart Home of the Holy Spirit, The.....	149	What is Fundamentalism?.....	409
Higher Criticism Claims.....	576	What is His Name?.....	207
How to Read the Newspapers.....	100	What makes a Good Sermon Good.....	151
Imagination and Life.....	573	Whence Life and Species?.....	272
Inasmuch.....	512	Why I Believe the Bible.....	268
In His Name.....	584	Will Princeton be lost to Presbyterianism?.....	347
Inner Circle, The.....	280	Wisdom.....	359
Inspiration of an Incomparable Investment.....	422	With Christ.....	426
Jesus the Master Teacher.....	281	Word with just One Meaning, A.....	274
John, First, 1:8 and 3:9.....		Words of a Witness, The.....	465
		You Remember?.....	578

COVER MESSAGES

Absolute Faith in Christ's Deity.....	June-July	Familiarity with the Bible.....	September
Accepting the Plain Intent of Scripture.....	December	God's Love and Care.....	January
Bible a Wonderful Book, The.....	May	Inspiration of the Bible.....	October
Bible, The.....	April	Jesus Christ the Son of God.....	August
Book that Proves Bible Inspired.....	November	Teaching and Believing.....	February
		Why I Love the Bible.....	March

EDITORIAL

Abusing the Power of Words.....	552	Bondage to Fear.....	403
Amazing Credulity of the Evolutionist.....	65	Burrell, David James.....	1
Another Shift of the Scenery.....	311	Burrell, David James, A Tribute.....	2
Applied Psychology.....	69	Burrell, David James, Defender of the Faith.....	3
Are we All in the Same Class, after all?.....	486	Champion's Inheritance, The.....	13
Are we Too Literalistic?.....	498	Christianity's Challenge.....	397
Being True to One's Solemn Vows.....	246	Colossal Task of the Modern Church.....	399
Bible only Guide for Church and Humanity.....	75	Conference of Liberalists and Scientists.....	315

Collapse of Evolution

By Dr. Luther T. Townsend

A beautifully printed pamphlet, with bright, strong cover, 64 pages. Orders for thousands of them were filled the first week they were off the press.

Dr. Townsend deals our Evolutionists a crushing blow. Get yours—and order a lot to give your friends.

Price 20c each; \$2.25 doz.; \$17 per 100 prepaid

25c Religious Pamphlet Package

Send us 25c for a worthwhile package of timely Religious Pamphlets, more than 50c worth. Try one!

Pulpit Bible Reading

A study in Vocal Exegesis or the Art of Sacred Reading. Bound in neat white antique paper cover. Price 25 cents.

Bishop Vincent: It is full of wisdom.

Christian Advocate: The spirit of this treatise is kind, just and practical.

Religious Telescope: Hope all our pastors will procure a copy.

Dr. Gunsalus: Pervaded by knowledge and good sense.

Sermon Outlines

These Sermon Sketches are available not only for Revival Services, but also for the ordinary preparation for the pulpit. They are Suggestive, Helpful Fresh Gems, and will prove very valuable to ministers in their study.

Sketches of Revival Sermons No. 4

Contains 60 full Sketches of Sermons, contributed by 50 different ministers, aiming at originality and suggestiveness of arrangement, price 50c.

Sketches of Revival Sermons No. 5

By Wm. J. Stevenson, D.D., singularly original and suggestive; 60 full Sketches of Sermons, price 50c.

The Tool Basket

300 Sermon Outlines, Pegs of Thought, Sunday-School Addresses, etc., gathered from various sources and grouped together in convenient form for the express purpose of helping to fix upon some suitable subject, thus affording assistance in time of need and emergency.

100 pages, flexible cloth, indexed thoroughly for ready reference by subjects and texts, price 50c.

The Seed Basket

A collection of 300 Sermon Outlines, Seed Corns, etc., similar to Tool Basket.

100 pages, flexible cloth, indexed thoroughly for ready reference by subjects and texts, price 50c.

Sketches of Sermons on the Lord's Prayer

By J. C. Hornberger, D.D. price 10c.

Worth While Pamphlets

Constructive Studies in Matthew, and John. Two paper bound vols. By Dr. Gregory. Special price, 35c each, prepaid. West of Miss. river, 40c. Both vols of great value to ministers and students.

The Higher Criticism, Dr. Sharaton..... .20

The Higher Criticism: A Present Appraise.
praisement, Dr. Bates..... .10

Counterfeit Criticism of Scriptures..... .10

The Editor in the Pulpit..... .05

Letters on Higher Criticism, Dr. Ridout.....10

Biblical Giving, Smith..... .05

Bible Champion Bound Volumes

Vols. 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, indexed,.....
each.....\$2.50

Vols. 1922, 1923, 1924, indexed, each.... 2.75

Vols. for 1925 and 1926 now ready, each..\$2.75
All prepaid. Uniform silk cloth binding.

Bound Homiletic Volumes For Ministers

Every volume contains and abundance of available material for pulpit preparation for Ordinary, and almost every conceivable Special, Occasion, completely indexed. It will be difficult to procure these volumes after our supply is sold out. Order a volume. Nothing more helpful; nothing so inexpensive!

Bound Volumes of the PREACHERS ASSISTANT, a Homiletical Magazine, Leather Binding, about 500pp, any volume from 1896 to 1905, prepaid.....\$1.75

Bound Volumes PREACHERS MAGAZINE, a Homiletical Magazine, all bound uniformly in Silk Cloth, about 570pp, 9 vols., between 1891 to 1901, prepaid..\$9.00
Single vol.\$1.25

Bound Volumes THE SERMONIZER, a Homiletical Magazine, all bound uniformly in Silk Cloth, about 380pp, any vol. 1912, 1914, 1915, 1916, prepaid..\$1.75

Bound Volumes THE SERMONIZER, in enlarged form, bound uniformly in Silk Cloth, about 475pp, vol. 1917 or 1918, prepaid\$2.25

Typewriter Ribbons---Carbon Paper

The Best Ribbon we know of at the price. High grade, non-filling, full length, permanent colors in any climate, perfect edge. Any writer using narrow ribbon, at 75c, prepaid.

The Best Carbon Paper we know of at the price—black, blue or purple. High grade, smooth and even.

25 sheet 60c; 50 sheet \$1.10; 100 sheet \$2.
All prepaid.

FRANK J. BOYER, Publisher, Reading, Penna.

YOU MUST

READ
ERNEST
GORDON'S

"The Leaven of the Sadducees"

"The greatest broadside against Liberalism put out in this generation." *Many authenticated facts cited will startle, but they await refutation.* Laymen buy by the dozen to give away. 263 pages, paper, \$1.00; cloth, \$1.50. *Detailed descriptive circular free.*

Bible Inst. Colportage Ass'n
837 North LaSalle St., Chicago

CHURCH FURNITURE
Everything for Church and Sunday School use. From Factory to You. Fine catalog free.
DeMoulin Bros. & Co.
1179 South 4th St., Greenville, Illinois



VEST POCKET BIBLE

31 Volumes
Sample Volume—five cents

Elizabeth Merriam
FRAMINGHAM, MASS.
Mention Champion

COURSES OF CONSTRUCTIVE BIBLE LECTURES

Address Rev. Dr. Harris H. Gregg,
Room 22, 113 Fulton St.,
New York, N. Y.

Does the Revelation Puzzle You?

—Send for "The Message from Patmos." Difficulties dissolved. Meaning made clear. 148 pages. Price \$1. Order from Presbyterian Depositories or writer, Dr. David S. Clark, 2438 N. 19th Street Philadelphia, Pa.

Books by Prof. Leander S. Keyser

Positive, evangelical, fearlessly apologetic but always fair to the opponent

A SYSTEM OF NATURAL THEISM. Second Edition, Revised. Cloth, 160 Pages. Price Net, \$1.35. In view of recent assaults on the Goodness of God, a more extended and adequate theodicy is presented than in the first edition. The insufficiency of the present-day mechanistic view of the universe is penetratingly exposed in harmony with the universal law of causality. All the anti-theistic theories are here thoroughly analyzed and their inadequacy clearly shown.

On the positive side, Personalism in philosophy and Theism in religion are shown to converge in the maintenance of the same doctrine. The old and new theistic arguments are fully explored, all of them leading by a logical process to the conclusion that a personal, all-wise and all-powerful God must exist and that He is the only adequate explanation of the varied phenomena of the universe. The divine attributes and relations are clearly set forth.

CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH: Essays in Criticism and Positive Apologetics. Net, \$2.00. This work is a defense of the evangelical faith—"the faith once for all delivered." While it is positive in character, it also gives an exposé of the radical Biblical criticism and the errors of scientific speculation. Dr. Robert Dick Wilson gives it a strong recommendation.

A SYSTEM OF GENERAL ETHICS. Cloth, 280 Pages. Price, Net, \$2.00. This book by Dr. Keyser teaches the right kind of morality, the only kind that will stand the acid test of these crucial times. "Up-to-Date," "Scientific," "Safe," "Sound," "Clear," "Strikingly Persuasive." Based on sound philosophical principles, and eminently timely and practical.

THE RATIONAL TEST. Price, 75 Cents. This is by all odds the best reasoned book on the cardinal doctrines of the Christian religion that we have read for many a day. The chief Biblical doctrines shown to be reasonable and satisfying.

THE CONFLICT OF FUNDAMENTALISM AND MODERNISM. Paper Cover, 36 Pages. Price, 30 Cents. The book for everybody! This tract is a Handbook of Information. It tells you just what you want to know; that is, just what the Modernists believe and what they don't believe; ditto for the Fundamentalists. Thus you will find out why they cannot get together. And all of it is told simply enough for laymen as well as others to understand.

A HANDBOOK OF CHRISTIAN PSYCHOLOGY. Price, 35 Cents per Copy; 3 for \$1.00. An outline of the psychical teaching of the Bible, correlated with the latest conclusions of science. This book was developed, and is used in the author's classroom. The author renders a distinct service by evaluating the various psychological theories and showing their relation to Bible teaching.

A MANUAL OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS. Cloth, 133 Pages. Price \$1.25. The author maintains the highest ethical standards and champions the old moralities. There is no blurring of moral distinctions. The book is refreshing at this time when there is much loose thinking on religious and moral themes, and consequently a tendency to disregard the old ethical sanctions.

THE DOCTRINES OF MODERNISM: Its Beliefs and Misbeliefs Weighed and Analyzed. Paper bound, 40 cents. In this book Dr. Keyser enters right into the heart of the present theological controversy. He believes that evangelical truth should be vindicated against the many gainsayers of the day. The Modernists whose works he brings to the bar are Harry Emerson Fosdick, James Moffatt, Shailer Mathews, Dea Charles R. Brown, Henry Van Dyke and Charles C. Morrison, Editor of The Christian Century.

People who desire to be posted in regard to the present conflict should read these books.

Frank J. Boyer, Publisher, Reading, Pa.

THE BIBLE CHAMPION

Official Organ of the Bible League of North America


Volume 33

DECEMBER, 1927

No. 12

EDITORIAL

Of Interest to our Subscribers



THE CHAMPION reckons time another year has passed. This number completes our thirty-third volume. We, too, seem to "spend our years as a tale that is told." Before another volume will be completed it will be ten years since the CHAMPION and the *Sermonizer* were consolidated. In these years many changes took place. Of the editorial staff of nine years ago the only ones now living to carry on the work are Professor H. W. Magoun and the managing editor. Several years ago, because of his manifold duties, Dr. Magoun found it necessary to submit his resignation; this now leaves the managing editor the only survivor.

The CHAMPION, from the beginning, was dedicated to wage war on modernism. Other isms there are, but the CHAMPION consistently determined to recognize no ism but modernism. So far as we know there is no other periodical, equalling the size of the CHAMPION, wholly given to this cause. And, if the hundreds of letters we are receiving are an indication, we believe we have been fairly successful in our efforts.

But what we now hope to impress on the minds of our friends is that this is not a one-man's job. There must be co-operation. There are quite a few things our friends can do to help us in this work, and we ask your interest. No one will hesitate to agree with us that there is not another periodical with a staff of editors the equal of ours. These men sacrifice much of their valuable time to help the cause. But to keep the CHAMPION going our friends should rally to our help. They can do this in several ways:

1. The price of the CHAMPION is \$2.00 in advance. Is your subscription paid in advance? Your Address Label will tell you. If it reads

Dec28, or any month and year later than that it is paid in advance. If it bears a date earlier than Dec28 it is *not* paid in advance. Please see your subscription is always paid in advance—help us in that way. The printer must be paid promptly every month. The CHAMPION is not published for profit; there has been a deficit every year of its existence. This deficit is covered every year by a friend of the CHAMPION. Help make it a little easier for him!

2. Call the attention of your friends to the CHAMPION and invite them to subscribe. Better still, ask them to permit you to send in their subscription. You may not appreciate how you can help us in this way! Your friends will thank you for your interest. To open the way to them, tell them if they subscribe now we will send free, as a premium, 5 previous numbers of the CHAMPION with a new subscription, giving them 17 numbers for the first year.

3. Send the CHAMPION to a friend as a Christmas gift. Why not to your pastor, to a seminary, a university or a college library?

4. We will send the CHAMPION to new subscribers three months for 35 cents.

5. Who will do this: Send us \$1.00 and we will send the CHAMPION to three persons he may name for three months.

The CHAMPION for 1928 will be an improved CHAMPION. We are always studying how to improve it. Without going into details we are confident you will appreciate our efforts to bring you each month the best we know to bring. We always encourage friendly criticisms and will welcome any suggestions our friends may have to offer. We ask you to co-operate with us in our efforts to increase the circulation of the CHAMPION.—F. J. B.

The Birth of Jesus Christ



AGAIN the season has arrived when all Christendom celebrates the birth of Jesus Christ. It is fitting and necessary that we give this event due consideration that it may not become a mere fetish or fable.

In the first place, it is a supernatural event, and as such we cannot reach it by philosophy or any form of human speculation or argument. It is not recorded in mere human history. The only source of our information concerning this fact is from the Bible, the Supernatural God-given Revelation. If the Bible is not supernatural, then Christmas is a mere custom observed by a certain portion of the race, and has no significance and no value. And if the Bible is not supernatural, all knowledge of the supernatural departs, and the Birth of Jesus passes with all other hopes and blessings, such as the resurrection from the dead, the atonement for sin, the new birth, the hope of heaven, the knowledge of right and wrong, the knowledge of God, and the hope of immortality. As to its date, its virgin character, and its meaning as the gift of God, the Birth of Jesus Christ is dependent upon the certainty of the Supernatural Revelation, the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

But if these Scriptures are the infallible supernatural revelation, the fact and nature of the birth of Jesus Christ is fully set forth, beginning with Moses, who declares He is to be "the seed of the woman," and carried forth through the Psalms, which declare God to be His Father, and the prophets, which declare that a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and His name shall be called Immanuel, and the evangelists, who record the birth in detail, and quote the prophecy of the virgin which the historical facts fulfill. The apostles embrace the whole world in their preaching and writings. Thus the promises and the record of the Birth of Jesus are woven in through the whole Scriptures, and to leave it out or change the record at any point is to reduce the Scriptures to fabulous fragments.

The fact of the Birth of Christ being assured by the infallible, unchanging Revelation, let us consider its significance. It was God's way of coming to man. It is distinctly stated that "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son." The Apostle Paul declares that God sent forth His Son, "made of a woman, made under the law," that "we might receive the adoption of sons," and He "might in all things become like his brethren." All this was

certified by the accompanying events of His birth; the wise men, the guiding star, and the message of the angels to the shepherds, "For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord"; the song of "the multitude of the heavenly host praising God and saying, 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will toward men.'" The worship of the shepherds and the wise men all declare plainly that Christ has come to man to dwell with him, "to reveal his glory as the glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."

Again His coming opens the way for man to ascend into fellowship with God. When we know Christ, we know the Father. Christ says: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." He promises a new birth, by which we are to partake of His nature as He partook of ours. When this is completed, we shall see Him, and "when we see him, we shall be like him." As man was subject to death, so Christ died with us and for us, and because He rose again, we also shall rise, and our bodies shall be like unto His glorious body, and He will come again and receive us unto Himself, that where He is, there we shall be also. So that Christ's coming to earth means the ascension of all believers in Him into the glorious heaven, and "so shall we be forever with the Lord."

The Birth of Jesus was a season of great gifts. God gave His only begotten Son to the world, and through Him gave eternal life and salvation to as many as received Him. The wise men, "when they had opened their treasures, they presented unto him gifts, gold and frankincense and myrrh." Through all succeeding ages Christendom has rejoiced in the birth of Christ, and has celebrated by thanking God for His Unspeakable Gift and by giving and receiving gifts among the members of the family and their friends. This season of home affection and fellowship, with its love tokens, has been through the centuries a time of joy, especially among those who have received and devoutly remembered first of all God's great gift of His Son.

But here, as elsewhere, we have fallen into temptation, and we have too often forgotten and overlooked the Great Giver and His Great Gift, and we have been carried away with a lower spirit and a lower conception. Our gifts have often become vanities, to satisfy pride or passing impulse. We have sometimes yielded to this temptation to such an extent that we have indulged in straining rivalry, and such

has been the expense and strain that the day has ended by leaving a load so heavy that those in responsibility have come to regard it with dread and suffering. It would be wiser if we returned somewhat at least to the practices of a simpler age, when the giver sought to serve the receiver with the work of his own hands, and with the intelligence of the mind and the love of the heart.

The happy day of Christmas is at hand. Let us resist with all power, intelligence and faith the present intense efforts of unbelief to belittle the fact of the virgin birth of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. While there is no authority to make the day a holy day, yet its observance should be consistent with love to God and love to man, full of joy and rejoicing.—D. S. K.

Some of Dr. Cadman's Departures



ONE of the most determined popular exponents of evolution is Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, whose syndicate newspaper talks, no doubt, reach a large number of readers. Recently he lauded Marshall Dawson's book, *Nineteenth Century Evolution and After*, which he thinks is a very illuminating work. It was reviewed in these columns some years ago (1923), and its defects were pointed out.

Dawson is the man who says that it was a great epoch in the history of the world when an aquatic animal became dissatisfied with its life in the water, and began to make adventures upon the land, and thus started the movement which, through ages on ages of effort, resulted in bringing forth all the land animals on the earth. And this theorizing strikes Dr. Cadman as most refreshing and helpful. Yet in all the world today there is not the slightest sign or gesture to indicate that any water animals are disgruntled with their condition and are trying to change into land animals. Why would any of them ever in the past have wanted to make such an exchange? Are not aqueous creatures just as well satisfied with their condition as land animals are with theirs? Are not both kinds of creatures equally well adapted to their environments? On such slender speculative threads dangles the great theory of evolution.

In one of his recent talks Dr. Cadman declared that the Bible does not require him to believe in the creation of the world "out of nothing." He says that the Hebrew verb (*bara*), translated "create," may mean to shape or form. Our reply is, the Hebrew verb *ya-tsar* (used in Gen.2:7 respecting the fashioning of man's body) means to form, fashion or mold, while the verb *bara* means to bring something into existence which had no prior existence; hence it means to create—*creatio ex nihilo*. Hence, when it is used in Gen.1:1, it means to bring something new into existence. The doctrine of an eternal evolution without creation is impossible. It was held by Plato and

Aristotle; also by the Gnostics and Manichaeans and the disciples of Zoroaster. It has always been treated as a heresy by the evangelical Christian church. It is simply being revamped by our modern heresiarchs.

Dr. Cadman's extreme departure from the evangelical faith appears in this denial of the doctrine of direct creation. According to his view, matter was never created; it has always existed. So then there are two eternals—God and matter? What a doctrine! But it cannot be, because all the parts of matter are finite; therefore the whole physical cosmos must be finite; but if it is finite, it must have come into existence in time; it could not be eternal, for that which is eternal must be infinite. Besides, there can be only one infinite, absolute and eternal Being—that is, God. There can be no such a process as an eternal creation. If matter were eternal, it would limit God, and that is a doctrine which human reason cannot tolerate.

Again, Dr. Cadman declares that God always "worked *with* something." Does he mean to put a limitation on the eternal God by saying that He could not have created the universe *ex nihilo*? Such a limited God could not manage, uphold and control this vast universe, because He would be limited in power and wisdom by the universe, which would be eternal, and therefore self-existent like Himself. Yet Dr. Cadman advances the conception that "an invisible creative force has always operated through visible means to achieve creative results." But every one ought to see that such a process would not be creation, but only the manipulation of eternally existent matter. A God who did not create the universe in the true sense of bringing it into being could not sustain it, for He would not be all-powerful.

Then Dr. Cadman bids us read "Henri Bergson's illuminating volume on *Creative Evolution*." But that would not help his puzzled readers any, because evolution can create nothing in the true sense of the term. Think it through: evolution could only have unfolded

something that already existed and that had been ended in its very creation with the potentialities needed for its development. The phrase, "creative evolution," expresses a contradiction. If at any point in the process something new—that is, some new entity or force—was brought into existence, that would have been an act of creation *ex nihilo*, and not evolution at all. As long as learned men use terms in an elastic and ambiguous way, there will be no clear thinking, and the wordy debate will go on.

After commending Dawson's book mentioned above, Dr. Cadman adds: "The author confirms my own view that no scientific theory has yet appeared which can be so easily baptized in Christ as that of creative evolution." It is evident that Dr. Cadman has become enamored with the Bergson phrase. We have already shown that such a process is impossible. But more is to be said. Dawson holds that nature has made progress through the struggle for existence, and that man got started and advanced by the same gory route. This means that progress has been made by one race of men crowding out and killing off inferior races, just as Drs. Osborn and Gregory have been teaching that the Cro-Magnon marauders and murderers moved over into central Europe some thirty or forty thousand years ago, and totally exterminated the Neanderthal race. Yes, that is the *Schrecklichkeit* depicted by the evolutionists. Can any one believe that such a theory can be "baptized in Christ"? We do not believe it. In fact, we *know* that it is not true. It *cannot* be true.

As was stated in a previous paragraph, Dr. Cadman rejects the doctrine of creation *ex nihilo*. He holds that the Hebrew verb translated "created" (*bara*) may mean to form. Suppose, then, we try to apply his idea to the first verse of the Bible. Let us see how it will look and sound: "In the beginning God formed the heavens and the earth." But that would not have been a *beginning* at all, because, according to Cadman, the material of the heavens and the earth always existed. Besides, he holds that God from eternity was creating and forming. Thus there could have been no *beginning*. Then what does the Bible mean by using the phrase, "In the beginning"? According to the Modernist, it is emptied of all meaning. That, dear reader, is what always happens to the Bible in the hands of the rationalistic critics.

But let us for a moment take for granted the doctrine of creation *ex nihilo*. Then we see at once the consistency and pellucid meaning of the sentence, "In the beginning God

created the heavens and the earth." The writer is describing the beginning of the universe, which had no prior existence. That is a *real* beginning. That makes sense out of the Bible. Otherwise there never was a beginning. Even if you should admit that the verb to create sometimes means to form, here it would have to mean creation *ex nihilo* in order to be a *beginning* of the universe.

Let us pass on to Gen.1:27, which teaches that God created man in His own image. This brief verse uses the verb "create" (*bara*) three times. Now if it means to bring something new into existence, all is as clear as the midday sunshine. Then God made a rational human being who previously had no existence. This gave man a unique place, and constituted him a genus by his lone. But if this verse means that God only "formed" man, out of what did He form him? Not one hint is here given that He formed man out of something that had a prior existence. If he was formed by evolution out of some animal stock, why did not the Biblical writer give some hint of such a process? It would have been very easy to do so. He might have put it in this terse and simple way: "And God formed man in His own image from one of the animals." But not the slightest hint of such an act or process is given in Genesis or anywhere else in the whole Bible. A direct act of creation is the only meaning the Biblical language will bear.

Indeed, the Biblical writer expressed himself with great care and precision, so that his language would never need to be misunderstood. When he came to describe the making of man's body (Gen.2:7), he did not use the verb "to create" (*bara*), but the verb "to fashion" (*yatsar*); because God did not then create the physical organism of man, but formed or fashioned it out of material which He had already created, namely, the finest material (*aphar*) of the soil. Who guided the writer in the choice of his verbs? In speaking of the making of the most essential part of man, that is, his mind or soul (Gen.1:27), he used the verb to create, because that is what the act was; but when he depicted the making of man's corporeal nature, he used the verb to fashion, form or mold. Here is more than human wisdom in the choice of words. But in portraying the formation of man's body, there is no intimation that it was formed from the body of an animal; it was formed directly from the soil. And it was so fashioned as to be a fitting companion-piece and habitat for the soul created in the divine image.

On the question of what might be called quasi-creation or mediate creation, lately advo-

cated by Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, Professor John B. Champion, in his recent book, *More Than Atonement* (p. 79, footnote), has a convincing statement: "We may here notice how serious is any view that displaces God as Creator. A God not needed in creation is equally not needed in redemption. Without a Creator in the full sense, there can be no purpose in creation, no end, and thus no fulfilment. That which gives God only a part-way place in the creation part-way displaces Him as its end and fulfilment. When we need no Creator, we can have no God. In the modern view God is Creator in name only, and sometimes not even that."

A writer in an infidel paper takes the same position regarding creation that is taken by the Modernists, especially Dr. Cadman. He says

that, according to Genesis, God "created the heavens and the earth." Then he adds this high-sounding statement: "But according to the best knowledge of modern science, 'the heavens and the earth,' that is, the world, were never created, but came into being by slow millennial stages, through complex and experimental processes, from heterogeneous and incongruous substance to harmonious correlations and multifarious forms." There! that explains everything! It makes it all primer plain! But, hold! perhaps there is one thing that needs to be explained: how came that "heterogeneous and incongruous substance" into being? Did it evolve out of nothing? If it did, that was the greatest miracle ever performed; and it was performed by Nothing! What a great Diana is Nothing!—L. S. K.

The Advocates are as Vocal as Ever



SOME of our good friends are wondering why so much space is devoted to the theory of evolution in these columns. Our reason is that the champions of that theory are as vocal and persistent as ever, if not more so.

They seem to be possessed by a kind of furor for carrying across their propaganda. On every hand they are trying to overwhelm the opponents of evolution. Sometimes they use argument, but more frequently they resort to ridicule and bold assertion, treating everybody who does not accept their views as if he were a mossback and an ignoramus. Books galore are pouring from the press, and the magazines and newspapers contain many articles advocating evolution.

For this reason it becomes the duty of earnest believers in the Bible to spend time and effort in resisting the tide of unbelief that is sweeping over the country as the result of the evolutionary obsession. We shall note a few among many recent instances.

Here come along two large volumes on evolution. One of them is a three dollar book, the other costs \$5.00. The first is written by two women, and describes primitive hearths in the Pyrenees. The authors tell their story in a delightful literary style, which adds to its evil effects; for everything they found is interpreted in accordance with the theory of evolution. Whenever they discovered something primitive in the out-of-the-way regions of the Pyrenees Mountains, they declare that it belongs to the Stone Age or some other remote age, and that the people who left those reliques must have lived so and so many thousands of

years ago, long before the dawn of man according to any historical records.

They seem to forget that you can go into many hinterlands today, and can find people living in as primitive a fashion as did the people in ancient times among the Pyrenees. In the history of the world there have been many times when highly civilized people and very primitive people have lived contemporaneously, just as is the case today. Go to central Africa at this very moment, and you will find people who correspond to the races of the so-called Flint Age, the Stone Age, the Bronze Age, etc. Only a few hundred years ago, when America was discovered, the Indians were living in the Flint Age. They were not even as highly civilized as were their predecessors, the mound-builders and the cliff-dwellers.

Another proponent who has been "checking up our racial pedigree" in the interest of the evolution hypothesis is Dr. John Murphy, who recently issued a book on "Primitive Man." He holds Herbert Spencer's dictum, namely, that "all evolution advances from an integration, through a differentiation, to a richer integration, and so on to a new differentiation." In these simple (?) terms a reviewer describes Dr. Murphy's view. Some of his explanations of the inception and advancement of human intelligence are remarkable—but the trouble is, they do not explain; they fail to go to the root of the matter. The question why and how some animals advanced toward human intelligence and reason, while others remained in their original animal status through all the ages, is not explained, or even hinted at, in this portentous tome.

Yet, ineffective as these two books are in proving evolution, many people will read them, and will think that evolution is placed upon a scientific basis. They are being exploited with full-page reviews in some of our widely circulated newspapers, most of whose editors would not accept an article in criticism of the books so widely advertised and so fulsomely praised.

Along comes another New York paper containing an article covering more than a closely printed page, written by a woman, giving the results of the recent investigations of Dr. Frederick Tilney, Professor of Neurology in Columbia University. He is closely associated with Dr. Henry Fairfield Osborn, whose zeal for the evolution theory amounts to an obsession. Indeed, Dr. Tilney undertook his researches at Dr. Osborn's request.

And what course did our neurologist follow in order to determine the origin of the human race? Did he even broach the idea that man might have been originally created in the divine image? Oh, no! Such a conception never seemed to have entered his mind. Indeed, Dr. Osborn requested Dr. Tilney to examine all "the world-famous specimens of prehistoric fossils." Says a reviewer of Dr. Tilney's work: "These rare exhibits were collected by the Museum, and represent the relics of human beings who lived on earth hundreds of thousands of years ago."

So, of course, Dr. Tilney was let loose in the notorious "Hall of Man" in the American Museum of Natural History, New York, of which Dr. Osborn is the president. Taking for granted that all the so-called "reconstructions" in that hall are correct, although most of them were reconstructed from only a few fossil remains, he went to work, never raising the question, apparently, as to whether the theory of evolution is true or not. Of course, it was a foregone conclusion that he would come out in favor of that theory, since he began with taking it for granted—that is, he committed at the very beginning the logical fallacy of begging the question.

He began with the Ape-man of Java, although the meager fossil remains of that creature are not in America, but over in Europe in the possession of Dr. Dubois. In spite of all the dispute among scientists regarding the few remains of the so-called Java man, Dr. Tilney accepted the theory that suited him, and then went to work to decipher the precise kind of a brain the creature had. Of course, no brain was in his possession, as only a part of the skull and a few other bones were found, and we cannot be absolutely certain that all of

them belonged to the same specimen, because they were not all found at the same time or at the same place.

We cannot follow him into the minutiae, but cite the following instance to indicate the uncertainty of the conclusions of the speculative scientists. He decided that the Ape-man lived 500,000 years ago; yet he "considered open-mindedly other estimates, which say 15,000,000." There surely is some difference between these two "estimates," now isn't there? A difference of 14,500,000 years! If scientists cannot agree better than that, why do they continue to inflict their vain conjectures on their fellowmen? Surely such speculations cannot rightly be called by the sacred name of science, which is defined as "verified knowledge."

Then Dr. Tilney examined all the other relics set in a row to boom the theory of evolution, and claimed to have found intelligence increasing according to the increase in the texture and articulations of the brain. For example, the Piltdown man had a finer brain than the Ape-man of Java, and so on.

But he never seemed to let himself be bothered by the fact that there has been all along more or less dispute as to the real size of the cranium of the Piltdown man. As Dr. Gregory—another devotee of evolution—says in an article in McClure's *Magazine* for March, 1923, if you tilt the bones of the skull at a certain angle, the Piltdown man had a very small brain; but if you tilt them at another angle, his brain was as large as the average human brain today. No notice of this difference of view is taken in Dr. Tilney's report of his findings. Everything favorable to evolution is smugly taken for granted.

In the metropolitan paper in which Dr. Tilney's researches are recorded are pictures of brains all arranged in the proper order to show development, beginning with the left hemisphere of *Pithecanthropus Erectus* (the Java Ape-man). No allowance is made for the fact that you can today find great differences in human brains as to both texture and complication. Some brains today reveal low intelligence, others high.

Pictures also appear in the same journal of groups of Neanderthal flint workers and of Neolithic men of the Nordic race. The former are certainly brutal enough in appearance. Two of the faces resemble the faces of tigers rather than of apes. How do the evolutionists know that they have correctly drawn the facial features of the Neanderthal race? The point we wish to make, however, is this: Can any one identify these Neanderthal and Neo-


lithic ruffians with the first man of the Bible, who was created in the image of God? Yet the Neanderthal men are supposed to be our forebears!

But even they are not regarded as the *progenitors* of the human race. They are not near enough to the brute. You must go back to the Heidelberg Man, the Piltdown Man and the Java Ape-man to find the original ancestors of *genus homo*! And even there you cannot stop—you must go back to the Primates, which were suppositional creatures from which both men and monkeys sprang, and therefore were still lower in the animal scale than the apes and monkeys! Where among all of these

specimens will you find the first man of the Bible? Nowhere. Hence the theory of evolution runs right plumb up against the clear teaching of the Holy Scriptures.

Do not our earnest and sincere evangelical readers think with us that we must continue to point out the errors and sinister effects of the hypothesis of evolution? As long as its advocates occupy the center of the field and are clamoring at the top of their lungs, some of the rest of us must go out into the arena and meet them. Do you not agree to that? Can we sit idly by and let this propaganda of a brute origin of man go on? We cannot with a good conscience do so.—L. S. K.

More Reasons for Watchfulness

 R. CLARENCE TRUE WILSON is the secretary of the Board of Temperance, Prohibition and Public Morals of the Northern Methodist Church. He is a prominent and influential man in that denomination. In an article recently reprinted in the *Southern Methodist* he gives an *exposé* of the insidious methods of the liberalists in the Methodist Church. It is enough to make men and angels righteously indignant.

By the presentation of many facts he shows that the methods of the liberalistic faction in the Methodist Church have been the same as those so mercilessly exposed in Ernest Gordon's *The Leaven of the Sadducees* in connection with the liberalism of the New England churches. It has been the cryptic and sly method. And, sad to say, it has been only too successful. The trouble is, the advantage lies with the liberalists when it comes to using guileful methods. True Christians cannot employ trickery. Their very principles compel them to be frank and aboveboard.

Dr. Wilson exposes the insidious methods of the liberalists in a number of instances. As a fair sample, we reprint what he says about the capturing of the Methodist Book Concern by the liberalistic partisans:

The next thing reached out for was the Book Concern. It had been for three generations the great conservator of the Christian faith. It centered true on the saving doctrines of the Gospel and made Methodists, and of the Methodists it made intelligent Christians.

Finally this group landed a publishing agent whose books typed the new thought in our church and who suppressed the books that looked the other way. If I wanted to name twenty such books, it would be easy to do, but every one would bring up an unpleasant story.

Bishop Foster had a contract to write his system of theology in eleven volumes. Six of them had been published and the other five were suppressed. The family

of the bishop left the Methodist Church because of the treatment.

One of the most outstanding of these cases of suppression was *The Dictionary of the Bible*, by Charles R. Barnes. Everybody knows who has had business relations with the Book Concern that when an author puts in his time to make such an elaborate book as that 1221-page volume, he enters into a contract to give the work to the Book Concern, and that they make a contract equally binding to do their utmost for its circulation and protection.

Dr. Barnes spent twenty-five years gathering up the information, writing and investigating, and his book was one of the most useful encyclopedias of Biblical learning that has ever been published.

There came a time when it evidently was decided that that book should be suppressed. Many men wrote for it, and were informed that it was now out of print and would not be republished. I wrote for this volume, and have the letter which says the volume is out of print and is no longer obtainable. At the time that letter was written to me there were hundreds of these volumes piled on the shelves in New York, in Cincinnati, in Chicago, in San Francisco and elsewhere. Knowing this fact, I wrote back, informing them that I knew it and that I should demand the sending of this book. I wanted two of them, and got them by return mail.

This is one of twenty things I know which show how our Book Concern was captured for a one-sided propaganda and used to suppress the other side.

The Course of Study for ministers was manipulated in the same way, as will be seen by the following from Dr. Wilson's article:

The next thing was to capture our Conference Course of Study. It must be gotten out of the hands of the Board of Bishops, for they were too conservative. It must be put in the hands of a group already constituted practically; and they came up to the General Conference with the proposition that the course ought to conform to the rules of pedagogy and be gotten up by professionals, and the course had already been outlined by these volunteers. The proposition looked so innocent that the General Conference fell for it, not because they were thoroughly convinced, but because there was no one authorized to lead an opposition. An individual could stand up, but a thing that had had an organization pushing it for three years could override an indi-

vidual. We needed right there a League for Faith and Life.

Well, they got their commission, and they gave us a Course of Study that has resulted in an agitation that has shaken our Church from one rim of the continent to the other. That first course of the first quadrennium was just as bad as bad can be. There were twenty books in it that would never have been selected by the Board of Bishops, and never ought to have been put in the hands of young men with the stamp of the Church's approval upon them.

Four years' agitation eliminated the most objectionable of them, but there is enough poison concealed in the present course utterly to vitiate the preaching power of young men who take it at its face value, and if they are put in the Conference Course when the Discipline requires that there shall be nothing in the course out of harmony with the standards of Methodism, why should they not take it at its face value?

Is this a time for evangelical Christians to be asleep at the switch?—F. J. B.

Some Random Thoughts on Evolution



F NATURE were in a state of flux or flow, as the evolutionists generally hold, that would be a fluid state instead of a state of fixity. Could man exist in an aqueous state like that? No! nothing could exist, not even the fish of the sea, for the sea itself must rest upon something stable, while its denizens subsist on certain species of creatures which must stay where they have been placed and what they are in order to be the proper kind of food for the creatures that feed upon them. So we see that stability of type is the dominant law in the organic realm, and is a most beneficent and necessary regime.

Again, a crucial question is this: If evolution is the sovereign law in the organic domain; if one species has an inherent "urge" to change into another, why does the process invariably result in fixity of type? For we certainly see every distinct species reproducing true to form at the present time in nature's realm. How could flux produce fixity? Yes, how can something evolve into its exact opposite? It must be admitted that the theory of evolution is contrary to the very nature of things; it is not based on sound fundamental and structural principles.

A leading article by Major Leonard Huxley, a son of the great evolutionist of the last century, appeared in the August number of *The Forum*. The striking title is, "The Survival of the Unfit." Just now we are interested in the following remarks, which some folks may take to heart: "But men of science must not pride themselves on being free from error. In their own often very narrow fields of study their conclusions should carry great weight; but they themselves often fail to realize that, outside those fields, they are trusting largely to their common sense, whilst not seldom claiming for the opinions they hold the infallibility of scientific truths. Scientific workers are apt, moreover, to pay too little attention to traditional warnings passed on from generation to generation; warnings which are often the crystallized wisdom of wise men in many past ages."

These are wholesome words, and should be heeded by all concerned. But we are in a quandary about "the survival of the unfit," which Major Huxley insists in his article may occur. Then evolution is not what it is often wont to be regarded—a continuous advancement from lower forms to higher through the struggle for existence. It seems to have changed in some of its phases into devolution. Then why continue to use the term "evolution" to express its exact opposite? Surely evolution is a term that flits and glimmers like a will-o'-the-wisp. Think of the unscientific habit of calling a process evolution, when we have the good dictionary word "devolution" to express the process of degeneration!

Mr. Huxley's proposed remedy for "the survival of the unfit" is eugenics. We must try to breed a better race, he says, by permitting only the fittest to have progeny. True, we must not go about this reform in too radical a way, so as to upset the world, but we should gradually overcome prejudice against the eugenic program by wise instruction.

On this question we do not feel competent to speak with authority; but we note that our reformer has nothing to say about helping the unfit to a better condition. He does not seem to think them capable of being uplifted. The only thing to do is to prevent them from bringing forth children who shall be inferior and irredeemable like themselves.

Just how this plan would work if wrought out in detail and actually practiced, it is impossible to say. But we note that the eugenists have nothing to say about the power of the gospel to change the unfit into the fit, as is so often done. Many people who once were sodden in sin have been cleansed, saved and uplifted by the grace and power of Jesus Christ. Even cannibal tribes have been thus transformed into saints. If eugenics is the sovereign remedy, it is strange that it did not come to the fore long ago. While it has been spending centuries in getting on its boots, the gospel of redeeming love and grace has been saving hundreds of thousands from ignominy.

ous sin and keeping myriads more in the pathway of virtue. The trouble with evolution is, it is too slow; too distressingly and monotonously *slow*.

Mr. Huxley believes strongly in heredity, and holds with some degree of assurance to the old Lamarckian doctrine of the inheritance of acquired characters. When we look at the facts as they are, we conclude that people are influenced by both heredity and environment. Sometimes the one is the stronger, sometimes the other. There are numerous cases on record in which men have been able to rise above the power of both. There are also many cases in which men have succumbed to the influence of either or both. Many times boys and girls who are badly born turn out to be the "fittest," by being placed early in the midst of a salutary environment, especially that of the Christian home and the Christian community.

To our mind, there is evidence of the inheritance of acquired characters to some extent within the type. If that were not so, no improvement could be made in the various species of domesticated plants, birds and animals. No cactus plant could have ever been changed into an edible plant by a Burbank. In the human family there is much evidence to indicate that to be well-born is a decided advantage, while to be ill-born is very unfortunate.

However, it must be remembered that the process of the transmission of acquired characters has never crossed the borderline of distinct species. Nature never changes one species into another. Neither can men, with all their skill and intelligence, accomplish such an exploit. They cannot improve the species; they cannot transmute species. The specific germ-plasm of each type was fixed some time in the ages past, so that each species procreates true to form. That is a fixed law of nature. It must be so, since the world is an orderly cosmos and not a welter of liquidity.

According to the theory of evolution, the lowest forms of life came first and flourished for ages before other and higher forms came into existence. On what, then, did the original moneron subsist? Did it, a living creature, live on pure mud? Again, according to this theory, vegetable forms existed and flourished in great profusion many ages before animals came into existence. But was that possible? Is not the vegetable kingdom dependent on the carbon dioxide given off by the breathing of animals? If that is so, as it most certainly is, vegetables and animals must have come into existence at practically the same time, because they are mutually dependent. These facts agree with

the Biblical teaching, but they give a fatal blow to evolution, which does not seem to be based on the natural world as it is.

When we made the foregoing statement in another journal some time ago, several persons criticised us very sharply. They held that enough carbon dioxide is produced in other ways to sustain the vegetable kingdom. We would not speak dogmatically on this point, for neither we nor our critics have ever lived in a world in which there were only vegetables, and so we cannot declare positively what would be the possibility or impossibility in the matter. But when we think of all the animals in the world, and try to calculate the immense amount of carbon dioxide they breathe out into the air, it seems reasonable to believe that a sufficient amount of this gas could not be produced in other ways to sustain all the vegetable life there is in the world. We cannot help believing that the world is an organism, and that each major element is necessary to the existence of the whole, just as the brain, the heart, the lungs, the stomach, etc., are each and all absolutely necessary to the continuance of the life of the human body. In our younger days the scientific books which we studied in select school and college stated positively that the animal world was necessary to the existence of the vegetable world, and *vice versa*. If that is not true, science has again shifted her position, and so is not very stable.

An editorial in the New York *Evening Journal*, written in a somewhat racy but slipshod style, recently told over again the gray-headed story about the evolution of the long neck of the giraffe. We read that wonderful tale when we were still a boy in our 'teens. It is this: The giraffe, age on age ago, was a short-necked animal like his fellow-creatures; but in seasons of drought the grass dried up, the lower leaves of bushes and trees were all devoured, and so he had to reach up higher and higher to get food, and the more he stretched his neck, the longer it grew, until "through evolution," as the editorial says, the animal "developed his wonderfully long neck and high front legs." Evolutionists believe that this process required "thousands of years."

We remember wondering, away back there in our youth when we first read that story, why the deer, the antelopes and other animals did not likewise develop elongated necks and front legs, if the droughts were so numerous as to cause the giraffe to use the elastic process through so many millenniums. We wondered, too, why the ancestors of the giraffe did not go elsewhere for their provender, just as the other animals must have done in order

to survive and perpetuate their species. And, besides, why does not the giraffe's neck continue to grow longer? And why do not some other animals show signs of an ambition to grow giraffeward? We have often seen ordinary cattle craning their necks to reach food at some distance from them, and we would expect their necks to increase in length in the course of the thousands of years in which they

have been doing that; but, somehow, their necks persist in remaining *in statu quo*.

Our conclusion is, the giraffe is a very poor specimen with which to bolster up the evolution theory. By the way, the giraffe is a spotted animal; the zebra striped. We wonder how evolutionists account for their marks, and the persistency with which each species has been breeding true to form for many thousands of years.—L. S. K.

God Manifest in the Flesh



TRICTLY speaking, we should speak of the advent rather than the birth of Jesus Christ. Those who deny that He was virgin born and that the possibilities that slumbered in His cradle are to be ascribed to a favorable heredity may and do speak of His birth, but they rarely if ever speak of His advent; and that because the latter word suggests his pre-existence, the thought that He was consciously alive prior to His birth in Bethlehem. And when we think of the nature of the Person who, according to the Scriptures, left another sphere of existence in order that He might enter into and share our mode of existence, it is obvious that the advent of Jesus involved a real incarnation of an absolutely unique sort. This will not be denied by any one who believe that Paul and John were speaking of an event that actually took place, not philosophizing, when the one wrote, "He who was in the form of God and who thought it not robbery to be accounted equal with God, made himself of no reputation and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men," and when the other wrote, "The Word which was in the beginning and which was with God, and which was God, was made flesh and dwelt among us."

The advent of Jesus Christ, as recorded in the Scriptures, is an event of a most extraordinary kind—one of the most tremendous with which the mind of man has ever grappled. We are never more conscious of the limitations of our own minds than when we endeavor to grasp its nature and significance. Even Paul, whose mind was the greatest of the Apostolic circle, as well as one of the greatest of all time, exclaimed, in view of it, "Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness."

The very greatness of the event has led some to question its reality. They have thought it too great to have taken place on this little planet of ours. This objection as it appeals to the modern mind has been phrased thus: "So long as the earth was believed to be the center

of the universe, and the only inhabited spot in it, so long was it possible to maintain that God had a peculiar love for the inhabitants of our world and had sent his Son for their redemption. But when the true relation of the earth to the sun and to the other planets of the system was discovered, then the idea that this little globe of ours should become the scene of so stupendous a divine drama as the Christian religion represents, should be the peculiar object of God's favor and the recipient of his revelations; that, above all, the Son of God should become incarnate upon its surface—seemed nothing less than incredible. In a universe teeming with worlds, presumably inhabited by intelligences of every order and degree, it is thought preposterous to connect the Deity in this peculiar and transcendent way with one of the very smallest of them."

While it is hardly to be expected that finite minds will be fully able to meet this objection, yet the following considerations, it seems to us, go a long way in that direction.

In the first place, it is not certain that our fathers were mistaken as to the significance of this planet. At any rate, so distinguished a modern scientist as Alfred Russell Wallace maintained that our solar system stands at the very center of the material universe and that our planet alone is adapted "to be the theater for the development of organized and intelligent life." If this be true, the mere material greatness of the universe is no objection to the Christian view. Over against the immensity of the material universe we can make our own the proud words, "I am of nobler substance than the stars. Or are they better since they are bigger? I have a will and faculties of choice, to do or not to do; and reason why I do or do not this; the stars have none. They know not why they shine, more than this taper; nor why they work nor what."

In the second place, even if other worlds are inhabited by moral and rational beings like ourselves, it may be that ours is the only world that sinned, that went astray, and so stands in

need of redemption and restoration. Suppose this universe is as full of intelligent life as the objection implies, but that this world of ours is, so to speak, the one lost sheep of the divine flock. Are we to suppose that the Good Shepherd would leave it to perish simply because it is small and insignificant?

"This earth too small
For Love Divine? Is God not infinite?
If so, His love is infinite. Too small!
One famished babe meets pity oft from man,
More than an army slain! Too small for Love!
Was earth too small to be of God created?
Why then too small to be redeemed?"

In the third place, the incarnation according to the Scriptures has significance for the whole universe. While its primary purpose was the redemption of mankind, it is not mankind alone whom it concerns. Cherubim and Seraphim, together with all the heavenly host, desire to look into these things; Principalities and Powers in the heavenly places are by it instructed in the many-sided wisdom of God; God brought it to pass that in the dispensation of the fulness of time He might sum up all things in Christ, the things in the heavens and the things on earth.

It is quite impossible for us to share the New Testament conception of the significance of Jesus Christ unless we realize that in Him we have to do with a God who became man and who continueth to be both God and man.

The Scriptures tell us that Christ's sufferings and death were sufficient to atone for the sins of the whole world—an utterly incredible statement if He were not God as well as man. Again they see in Jesus one who speaks with authority—not with a delegated authority as in the case of prophets and apostles, but as one who is Himself the source of truth. Only as we see in Him one who came forth from the Father, one whose rank in the scale of being place Him alongside of the Father, can we allow that He has a right to speak with such authority. Yet again consider the loyalty and devotion of New Testament Christians to Jesus Christ. For them He was an object of worship. If we are to yield Him the same devotion without being guilty of idolatrous hero-worship, it must be that He was really the Son of God who became incarnate for us men and for our salvation.

There is and can be no adequate appreciation of the significance of Christ for thought and life except by those who realize that "the only Redeemer of God's elect is the Lord Jesus Christ, who, being the eternal Son of God, became man, and so was, and continueth to be, God and man, in two distinct natures, and one person, for ever." Others may account the Christmas season the happiest of the year, but they have but small realization of the significance of the event it commemorates.—D. S. K.

A Sample of Behaviorism



ONE of the crucial sciences of the day is psychology. At the same time it is a very practical science. It cannot help having a real and vital influence on life. True, some people may be inconsistent in holding a logically debasing view of psychological processes, and yet, on account of certain antecedents and environments, may live quite respectable lives.

Yet, if the populace should once become seriously saturated with monism, behaviorism and determinism, there is no telling what might be the debasing effect on human society and government. Think of the result if all people were to believe that nobody is responsible for his thinking and conduct. What weak and namby-pamby characters that view, if seriously taken, would produce!

As a specimen of baleful psychology we refer to an article by Dr. John B. Watson, the *infant terrible* of the behavioristic school, in *Harper's Magazine* for June, 1926, and which has only recently come to our notice, or it would have received attention earlier. It is

entitled, "How We Think: A Behaviorist's View." We quote from Watson:

"Thought, then, is a form of general bodily activity, just as simple (or just as complex) as tennis playing. The only difference is, we use the muscles of our throat, larynx and chest instead of the muscles of our arms, legs and trunk. If we could actually see the play of the muscles of the chest, throat and larynx when we think, no mystery would have ever grown up."

Perhaps most people will think this statement scarcely worth refuting; but it is made by a noted psychologist who lectures in one of our foremost universities and who has written somewhat extensively in advocacy of his peculiar views. So let us note what a lame and inadequate theory it is.

He says, "If we could actually see the play of the muscles of the chest, throat and larynx when we think, no mystery would have ever grown up."

Our reply is, we do not and cannot actually see the play of the said muscles when we think,

and no one has ever seen it; therefore Dr. Watson's theory is based on a guess, and is not founded on actual observation. Remember he is a monist, reducing everything to material substance and mechanical movement. Hence he must produce evidence that actually comes within the range of one or more of the senses; but this he cannot do with the said muscles.

Again, why must all human thinking be confined to certain muscles of the body, especially those of the throat, larynx and chest? Compare the act of swallowing with playing tennis—does not the latter activity require more thought than the former? We often swallow our food with scarcely any mental activity—almost automatically; but no one can play tennis with real interest without using his mental powers with a great deal of conscious and determined effort. So our thinking is just as intimately connected with the muscles of the legs, arms and trunk as it is with the muscles of the throat when we swallow.

Besides, when we see and hear, do we not think? And are we not just as conscious in such cases as when we taste or speak or sing? The patent fact is, the human mind is more or less vitally connected with the whole organism of the body and with each of its parts. You can hold out your arm and crook your index finger by an act of conscious volition. Try it and see.

But even if mental action—thinking—were restricted to larynxial muscular action, the process would still be an inexplicable mystery. When food passes over the palate, we challenge all the schools of psychology in the world to explain how the physical sense of taste is carried up into the consciousness, so that we say positively, "This food tastes very good!" If Dr. Watson were to deny the experience of taste, we would politely inquire of him, "Does your food taste sweet or sour, palatable or unpalatable?" If he refused to answer, we would have to accuse him of having scrambled up a tree. We insist that thinking in connection with the muscles of the throat, larynx and chest is just as mysterious fundamentally as in any other kind of physico-psychical activity and experience.

Besides, as has often been said in this journal, matter, in its basic essence, is just as mysterious as is mental substance. And, moreover, when we come to analyze deeply, we are just as conscious of purely mental activity—thought, emotion, volition—as we are of physical data and movements. Indeed, while we clearly experience thought and feeling as psychical facts, we cannot get into the human brain to *see* or *feel* its molecular motion in connection with

these psychical experiences—if there is such molecular motion. All told, the movement of the brain—if there are movements—in connection with their accompanying mental activities are too fine and obscure to be observed.

Thus we are more definitely aware of psychical acts and experiences than we are of the physical phenomena that run parallel with them. This means that pure psychology, which believes in an entity called the mind, is placed on a more scientific basis than is Behaviorism, which depends on speculation for its holdings. What the brain and the muscles do we cannot decide except as we apprehend them with our minds. The behaviorist himself cannot define and defend his crude and crass theory without bringing it under the purview of the very consciousness and other mental operations which he denies. Therefore his position is unreasonable, and it is contrary to universal experience.—L. S. K.

* * *

Notes and Comments

A correspondent of the *Moody Bible Institute Monthly* asks the editor the following questions: "How do you explain the two creations in the first and second chapters of Genesis? Which account are we to accept?" To which the editor rightly replies: "The simplest explanation, and one which seems to account for all the facts, is that we do not have two separate and distinct accounts of creation, but first a general account in chapter I, and a second supplementary account in Chapter II, in which further details are given. That is according to the law of recurrence, which is quite common in the Bible. First a general statement is made, and later some special matter is taken up in greater detail."

The above interpretation is correct. The first two chapters of Genesis are not *contradictory*, but *complementary*. What one omits the other supplies. The first chapter gives a general account of the whole creation. The second chapter tells us about the fashioning of man's body and its union with the soul, the garden which was to be man's first habitat, and the forming of woman from the seminae being of the generic man. If we did not have the first chapter, we would not know many things that God wanted us to know, namely, that "in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth"; that He brought the various kinds of life into being by successive and progressive acts of creation, each to reproduce "after its kind;" that at last He created the soul of man in His own image." If we did not

have the second chapter, a number of important details of the early life of primitive man would be unknown, such as are above indicated. Yes, the two chapters are complementary.

In a recent book by two arch-liberalists (who are Methodists nominally, but not really), we read the following: "With the turn of the century, Methodism faced and answered another great question—whether its ministers were to be judged by the theological opinions which they held or by the spirit and results of their work for the kingdom." Yes; that is just the trouble with the Modernists: they are always talking about freedom of "opinion." Just as if the Christian religion were a mere matter of "opinion"! Where is the "experience" of which Methodists used to say so much and bear such clear testimony? If our holy religion is a mere matter of human opinion, it is not worth contending for. Then there will be about as many different opinions as there are individuals. The only way to have a consensus is for all persons to get a clear-cut Christian *experience* which is able to say, "I know whom I have believed."

One of the mottoes of the authors of the above-named book is, "think and let think." This is characteristic of Modernism. Oh, just let us think as we please! Well, that slogan would soon destroy Methodism and Protestantism and Christianity. If people can think just as they please, what need have we of the Bible and of Christianity and of the church? The infidel makes the same plea—he wants to be alone in his "thinking"—except that he wants the privilege of abusing Christian people who do not think as he thinks. Would Luccock and Hutchinson (the authors of the book in question) be willing to permit an infidel to be received into membership in the Methodist Church, if he applied? We wish they would answer that question. If they would not, they would be disloyal to their cardinal principle, "think and let think." If they would admit an infidel into the Methodist Church, that would soon mean goodbye to that church. We hold that, when men voluntarily join a church with certain doctrines and standards, they are ethically bound to accept, uphold and proclaim them; and if the time should come when they cannot do so, the only ethical course for them is to withdraw.

On this question of letting everybody think as he pleases in the Christian church, something more needs to be said. On the deep problems of human life, has human thinking

been so very, very successful? Do the scientists and philosophers agree very well? Are there not about as many different opinions as there are individuals? Look over the history of philosophy, and note how many different systems there are. Plato and Aristotle could not agree. The latter left the school of Plato and established a lyceum of his own. Neither of them taught the same philosophy as did Democritus and Lucretius. Kant and Spinoza taught fundamentally different systems. The same is true along all lines of human thinking. Thus mere human opinion is too uncertain and variable a thing on which to build a Christian church. The only unifying principle and power in the Christian church is a real experience of regeneration, giving the subject an inner assurance that Christ is the world's Redeemer and that the Bible is God's holy and inspired Word. Where such an experience has taken place, there is practical unanimity among Christians on everything that is important.

After all, the maxim "to think and let think" is not a feasible slogan for any organization, in spite of its advocacy by Luccock and Hutchinson in *The Story of Methodism*. Even Dr. Cadman, the notorious champion of Modernism and its invariable accompaniment, evolution, drew a line the other day in one of his syndicated talks. He was asked what he thought of a church which refused to call a minister who believed in evolution, but who was otherwise a good and gifted man. Of course, he flew into a rage over such "narrowness." Yet he did say that, if a man should advocate mere mechanical evolution, a church would be justified in turning him down if he became a candidate for its pulpit. So, after all, even an advocate of the doctrine of "think and let think" will draw the line where he thinks a line ought to be drawn—only he does not want to let others draw the line where they think it should be drawn. The long and short of it is, when an organization has a determinate set of principles, no one has a right to belong to it unless he accepts and upholds them. That is only common sense and sound ethics.

The *Presbyterian Advance* has evidently gone over body and soul to liberalism and evolution. It recently opened its columns to George S. Duncan, Ph.D., a professor in the American University, Washington, D. C., who entitled his article, "The Anti-Evolution Crusade." He uses the antiquated methods of the evolutionists, who certainly think and talk *semper idem*, never getting out of the beaten

tracks. He says: "The cure of this anti-evolution movement is a campaign of accurate knowledge, since the crusade is largely due to ignorance." And yet the children of our grammar grades and high schools are being taught evolution! Books galore are written on the "A B C of evolution." Why cannot intelligent matured men and women understand what evolution means and the scientific facts that tell against it?

The cannonading against the Holy Scriptures continues. It is indulged in even by some Canons of the Church of England. This time it was Canon Wilson, of Cheltenham, who exclaimed: "Could anything be more unsuitable for a young married couple to be told what nobody believes—that woman was created out of man?" But that is not what the Bible teaches—that woman was "created" out of man. Why does not the Canon study his Hebrew? Woman was builded, formed, fashioned (Hebrew, *banab*) from a part of the side of man. No doubt the meaning in modern language would be, she was formed from a portion of the seminal substance of the man, thus preserving the solidarity of the race and at the same time achieving the differentiation of sex. This is most wonderful and scientific. How would Canon Wilson explain to a young married couple the origin of the race and the beginning of sex? Would he tell them they came up from the oyster and the angleworm? That surely would be uplifting and entrancing!

It is indeed pathetic to note how unbelievers misunderstand and burlesque the teaching of the Bible. In the September number of the *Forum* occurs a debate between Professor James H. Leuba and Professor J. Arthur Thomson on the question, "Are Religion and Science Irreconcilable?" The former affirms and the latter denies. The position of Dr. Leuba is thus summarized by the editor's introductory note: "It is the Christian religion—a definite body of belief concerning a universe in which an all-seeing and all-powerful God notes the sparrow's fall and answers human prayer—which conflicts irreconcilably with the teachings of science. Science has banished forever this notion of a fickle God upsetting the natural sequence of cause and effect, in answer to the bribes and pleadings of human worshippers; and without this belief Christianity is no longer Christianity." What a caricature of Christianity! Think of representing Christian prayers to a loving God as offering Him "bribes"! When a child asks a favor or a blessing from its parent, is that an effort to "bribe" the parent? We may well ask, is

nothing too sacred to be travestied by infidelity?

We are glad that Professor Thomson writes in a better vein. His chief contention is that religion and science deal with different spheres of reality, and thus do not come into conflict. However, the religion he represents is mere theism, and scarcely even that, but more like deism. It is far removed from the Christian religion, which recognizes the supernatural as ruling over and above the natural and integrating with the natural. And what does he mean by deriding the idea that "man was created by the Trinity on a midsummer day 4004 B. C. at eleven o'clock in the morning"? Who ever propounded such a childish view? We challenge the scientist to produce his authority, giving the title of the book and the page. Besides, do the scientists never read a *modern* book on orthodox theology? They do not, or they would not continue to commit such ludicrous blunders. Nobody today pretends to know the precise date when the first man was created, because Biblical chronology, like other chronology, is uncertain.

However much we may differ from some contentions in Professor Thomson's articles with others we are in cordial agreement. For example, when he says that "the religious mood must decline to accept the statement that man is an episodic emergence in a long chapter of accidents," we desire to underwrite every word of the statement. Man is not a mere episode in the history of the cosmos. He is rather its goal and consummation, the being for which it was planned and made. Why? Because, so far as we can see, so far as science can see, and so far as religion can see as well, man is the only self-conscious and rational personality in the world. We can find nothing nobler, worthier, more rational on this planet than the good, unselfish, upright man. Man is the only being who can say "I," and know what he means by it. Therefore it is unreasonable to believe that he is a mere incident by the way. It is reasonable to believe that he was the goal which the Creator had in mind when He projected the world. If he was not, why did the creation stop with man? Why were not beings of a still higher order created?

But with the following sentiment in Dr. Thomson's production we must take issue: "The scientific mood must ask for a reconsideration of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body in its usual crude theological presentation." Physical science—and that is the only kind of science these debaters have considered

—can say nothing respecting the resurrection of the body at the last day. All that physical science can say is, that it knows nothing of such an event; as far as it can observe its data, the body, once it is dead, is never resuscitated. But it cannot declare dogmatically that a resurrection of the body is impossible. The statement also reveals a lack of knowledge of theology when the author speaks of the "usual crude theological presentment" of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. True Biblical theology does *not* present this doctrine in a "crude" way. It teaches that the resurrected body is glorified and refined, and thereby becomes a fit mate and habitat for the purified soul. The apostle says: "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power." What is there that is "crude" about such a representation? Are not the scientists themselves aware that some forms of matter are exceedingly refined and subliminal? If the Christian doctrine of the resurrection is crude, will the critic please tell us what *he* would regard as a refined conception of the resurrection? Isn't it inconsistent for physicists, who deal almost exclusively with matter, to gird at the doctrine of a fitting material temple for the soul in the final consummation of all things? After all, they do not seem to think much of the only material with which they deal and which they think is the only existent entity.

There are two classes of entities in the world—the mechanistic and the mental, the physical and the psychical. Broad-minded people will recognize the reality and the place of both. No one should deny the mechanical. There are machines. The physical universe is a vast machine. Even our bodies; although endowed with life, act to some extent in a purely machine-like way. Some functions are not under the control of the mind except in a more or less indirect way. Such processes are digestion and the action of most of our glands. Over these we exercise little control. However, there is another large body of facts that cannot be explained in merely mechanical terms. They belong to a different category, that of the mental. When you say, "I think," or "I will," or "I feel," you cannot put those experiences in the purely mechanical class. They may have their intimate relation to the mechanical; indeed, they may function in a mechanical environment and on a mechanical arena; but there is something about them that is vastly superior to mere automatic action. All materialists ought to be able to see these patent facts, for unless men will recognize *all*

the data of the world and of human experience, they will always be narrow and one-sided. A dualistic view, which recognizes all the facts and experiences of both the mental and the physical realms, is the only view that is broad and all-sided. The very language that we use implies these two spheres. If there were not two spheres of objective reality, how would the human mind ever have been able to use two such terms as *matter* and *mind*, and attach to them such vastly different meanings? In many cases intuition and common-sense are much better than mere curious speculation.

There are attempts today to belittle theology. A recent writer has been setting up a plea for "untheological Christianity." Some one replies, "You might as well plead for a boneless body." Certainly a religion without theology would be a cartilaginous structure. A strong writer says that the plea for "untheological Christianity" is simply a "plea for unregulated, disorderly thinking." It is an attempt to have religion without scientific order and classification. There may be many good Christians in the world who know little scientific theology, but they would have no religion today to inspire and comfort them had it not been for the theologians of the past who have, all along in the history of Christianity, set forth its principles in order, shown their rational character, and defended and upheld them in the face of implacable foes.

A writer who often becomes quite superficial in his efforts to decry theology seems to think that he has scored a point in the following simile: "Religion is poetry; theology is prose." Well, do we not need prose as well as poetry? What kind of literature would we have, anyway, if every writer had to put his thoughts in poetic form? The fact is, the writer's comparison is a very lame one, because, after all, prose is more necessary than poetry. The same writer uses other mistaken comparisons. He thinks that religion is like a garden of flowers, while theology is like a book on botany; religion is like "a sky full of stars," while theology is like a manual on astronomy. But such a critic is impossible; he is apparently unable to see that we need both flowers and botany, both stars and astronomy, if we are going to be thoroughgoing and scientific.

Says a spiritually minded writer: "In Exodus 24:15,18, Moses at God's command went up into the mount, and waited six days for God's voice. On the seventh day God spoke to him out of the cloud. 'Moses was six days getting the sound of earth out of his ears, so that

he could hear and understand God's message." This is a suggestive thought. It indicates why we sometimes fail to clear our minds of worldly pursuits and interests when we go to God's house, and find it difficult to center our minds upon the worship of the sanctuary.

A clear and cogent orthodox writer points out the beautiful adjustment of the supernatural and the natural in God's dealings with men. They are not two antagonistic acts of God, but are wonderfully correlated. He says: "One task of the theologian is to state helpfully the relation between the natural and the supernatural; for divine deliverance, of necessity taking its rise in the supernatural, needs to flow down into the natural. Salvation, like any other miracle, must take place in the natural realm. Elsewhere it would not be a miracle. Heaven has never seen a miracle. What is supernatural here is natural there." How suggestive! There is no antithesis between the natural and the supernatural. The latter is no "intrusion" into the former. It does not make "an occasional raid into nature." No; the supernatural and the natural are "at home" in each other's company.

After listening to a helpful sermon on the comfort and reasonableness of Christian faith on a recent Sunday, the organist of the church, who was a woman of the spiritual mind, said something like this: "What a restful and worshipful service this has been! I have gotten real strength from it. Do you know that we hear so much about 'pep' and 'go' and 'live wires' today that one is constantly kept in a state of nervous strain and excitement. There seems to be no time for quiet communion with God; no time to rest in Him and recuperate one's strength. Even in church we are so often urged to be 'doing something' that one wonders when we shall have a chance to go apart and rest a while from the turmoil and stress of life."

The following statement by Bishop Warren A. Candler seems to be quite drastic, but, everything considered, it must be said to be deserved: "These liberals, building nests like cuckoos in the institutions of evangelical churches, are causing disturbance and disorder where purity and peace should prevail."

Have you noticed that the liberals never cheap a word in reply to Ernest Gordon's scathing *exposé* of their methods in his eye-opening book, *The Leaven of the Sadducees*? Why do they not answer it? Because they know that they cannot. They are well aware that before any court of common equity their

underhanded method of filching churches and church property from evangelical people cannot be justified. So they take refuge, like all people who know they are guilty, in silence. Their motto is, "The less said about it the better." If they were even to mention Mr. Gordon's book, they might advertise it, and thus give it wider circulation. Just keep quiet, they say to themselves, and the book will soon be forgotten! Yes, it is policy, not principle, that governs the liberals.

The following apt remarks were made in a recent address by Bishop Collins Denny, of the Methodist Church, showing that there still are churchmen who do some clear thinking: "The background and authority of Jesus' claims to divine glory is the fact of His resurrection. This Modernism denies. I cannot understand how a man can deny the resurrection of Jesus Christ and call himself a Christian. They (the Modernists) speak of 'spiritual resurrection,' but their spiritual resurrection is no resurrection at all." Then he adds that, in the presence of the modernistic denial of the physical resurrection of Christ, "we dare not keep quiet. We must speak out."

We capture the following statements from a recent book, believing they will appeal to every Spirit-born disciple of Christ: "For the infinitely important work of regeneration no truth fits the hand of the Holy Spirit, so to speak, like that of Holy Writ. Between the two works of the Spirit, the inspiration of the Scriptures and the regeneration of men, there is a strong bond of affinity and unity. The Spirit-born soul and the Word-fed life are in a divine alliance from the beginning. Receiving the Word of God is an experience of God; and an experience of God must be in keeping with the Word of God. Experience which conflicts with, or thought that contradicts the teaching of, Holy Writ has another inspirer than the Holy Spirit; for He cannot contradict or conflict with Himself." There! that is sound thinking, based on a genuine Christian experience.

Nothing that the Bible teaches escapes the hypercriticism of the Modernists—a fact that makes it necessary for the defender of the faith always to be on the alert. Not long ago one of the modernistic school girded at the doctrine of the ascension of Christ to the right hand of the Majesty on high, saying that such an act on the part of Christ would have been impossible, because the earth is round, and any direction away from it is *up*. Therefore, how could He have ascended *up* on high? All one needs to do is to think a little more deeply to

answer all the captious objections of the Modernists. Suppose that our Lord ascended from Mount Olivet during the daytime, as He evidently did. Now can we suppose that, when Jesus ascended into clear space, He could not have found the center of the universe where God reigns, wherever that may be? If any place away from the earth is up, then, no matter what direction he took, after He left the earth, would have been up. Thus easily are the criticisms of the Modernists answered. Therefore the apostle committed no astronomical error when he said of Christ, "He ascended far above all heavens that He might fill all things." This would mean that He became transcendent, as He had been before His self-humiliation, in order that He might be immanent—that is, present everywhere in the spacial realm.

We once heard an unbeliever exclaim: "Think of living forever and forever! Isn't it an awful thought?" And he seemed almost to shiver. Our rejoinder would be something like this: And so you are afraid of the adventure into eternal life, are you? Well, that is not very heroic. That is not the mark of a courageous person. We have known many unlearned but pious people who, instead of being terrified by the thought of eternal life, rejoiced in it with exceeding great joy. They were not afraid to make the adventure. There must be something wrong with a man's ethical and spiritual state—and he must be aware of it—if he feels daunted by the conception of living forever. The person who has peace with God through the Lord Jesus Christ is thrilled by the idea of an eternal existence of blessedness and glory in fellowship with God and the spirits of just men made perfect. With him it is not an adventure with a dubious ending.

Here is still more evidence that the evolutionists are keeping up their propaganda and need constant watching. A revised edition of Sir Arthur Keith's *The Antiquity of Man* was recently issued, and is being extensively reviewed and praised by the devotees of evolution. But has he placed the theory on a scientific basis? A careful reading will show that he has not. For example, differing from Henry Fairfield Osborn's latest dictum, Dr. Keith thinks that the Piltdown man is older than the Java Ape-man, and lived "not less than half a million years ago." But a great controversy arose over the meager remains of the Piltdown man (see Charles Johnson's article on Keith's book in the *New York Times Book Review*, Aug. 28, 1927. p. 4). One "distinguished anthropologist" decided that the brain

capacity of Mr. Piltdown was only 1,070 cubic centimeters, "no more than the brain of an Australian aboriginal," while Sir Arthur Keith thinks that it was 1,500 cubic centimeters, "equal to that of a modern European." And yet, in spite of this disagreement among the pontiffs of evolution, they and their campfollowers think that their theory is proved. If Mr. Piltdown had a brain pan as large as "a modern European," that fact itself gives evolution a solar plexis blow.

But (continuing the preceding discussion) even if the Piltdown brain capacity was only 1,070 centimeters, it would still disprove evolution; because there are people living today with smaller skulls than that. Anyway, this mania for measuring man's intelligence by the size of his brain is aside of the mark, and comes to nothing. Personally we know many men with large brains who have mediocre minds (and this is no reflection on their characters); while many men with comparatively small brain capacity have excellent intellectual powers. The trouble with the zealots of evolution is, they seem to get off the logical track on every topic they discuss.

A couple of chimpanzees in a zoological garden which we recently visited acted very intelligently. Everybody admitted that they were very "cute." While we were discussing them, and raising the query about evolution, a friend declared that he once had a horse that was just as intelligent as were those simians, and would do many *useful* things that they never would or could do. He also said that he knew a dog that was just as intelligent as any monkeys he had ever seen or heard of. Some other friends told us about the wonderful performances of a number of trained fleas, which were actually hitched up to tiny wagons and pulled them around as their trainer directed them. We remember having read the story of those trained fleas some years ago, and were impressed with their remarkable intelligence. So we must remember that, in the matter of mentality, the monkeys and apes are no nearer the human standard than are some other animals and even insects.

Our stalwart friend, the editor of *The Lutheran*, often delights us with statements of a solid character, very different from many pronouncements that come from the liberalistic brand of tripod utterances. In writing on some of the great needs of seminary education today, he says: "The divinity school idea after the pattern of the German university or the English Oxford conception, where theology is studied as a pure science, will never meet the

requirements for preaching to this temporizing, time-serving age. Like the prophets of old, our young men must be taught to live on the mountain tops with God, and be filled to the brim with the message that bears the stamp of a 'Thus saith the Lord.' Oh, for more editors who would speak in such clear and resonant tones!

Some uninformed person exclaims: "Do we not have evolution right before our eyes? Do we not see the grain of wheat evolving into a stalk and producing other grains?" But, dear friend, that is not the theory of evolution at all as it is held and heralded by its scientific promoters. What you have described is merely the growth or development of a seed "after its kind," just as the Bible teaches, and is an operation of nature that you can see with your eyes all around you. But the evolution theory is something very different: it teaches that all kinds of life developed from a single primordial cell; that some vegetables become animals in the course of millions of years; that each form of life unfolded into the next higher. All the evolutionists teach that you and I, dear reader, came from an animal stock—the same stock as the monkeys, apes, baboons, chimpanzees, quadrilles and gorillas. Unless you believe that you have descended from a beastly ancestry, pray do not call yourself an evolutionist. If you do, you put the wrong label on yourself and get yourself in the wrong crowd.

We are always ready to correct errors that may occur in our columns. In the August number of this magazine (p. 406, first column) we stated that "you can scarcely find even second-hand copies of the works of Voltaire and Paine." At the time that paragraph was written, which was in May, the statement was correct, as far as we knew. But an angry correspondent has called our attention to the extensive advertisements of the new editions of these infidel works, brought out by infidel firms. There is no call to fly into a rage over the affair, and to treat people as if they were "liars" when mistakes occur. The error is hereby corrected. It is only too true that the infidels of our country and England are boldly pushing the sale of the works of Voltaire, Paine and other unbelievers. That fact makes it all the more necessary for evangelical men to defend the faith, present their strongest reasons for accepting the Bible as God's special revelation of redemption, and live according to its ethical and spiritual teachings.

But we are not the only people to make mistakes. For example, it is a sad mistake for

infidels to charge Christians with insincerity, ignorance, deception, and a desire to persecute people who do not believe in Christianity. We doubt whether there is a Christian in the land—at least, we are sure there is no *true* Christian—who would want to persecute anybody. For Christians to defend their rights, to uphold their faith, and to expose the errors of their opponents—that is not persecution. It is defense against assault. Yes, the infidels are making many sad blunders in impugning evil motives to Christian people. We would not hurt a little finger of them, nor would we, even if we could, singe a single hair of their dainty locks. No; we would rather have them converted to Christianity, so that they, too, might enjoy its benefits and comforts. Another mistake they commit is to try to rob Christian people of their chief source of comfort and joy.

Our table within the last few months has sometimes become fairly loaded with infidel literature. We glance over all of it, and read some of it. Part of it is too vituperative to justify spending valuable time upon it. When a writer begins by calling Christians ugly names, we do not read his article, because we know that, when a man is in an angry and scornful mood, he cannot be in a judicial frame of mind. Then why read his output? We want to say something to our readers regarding these infidel periodicals: *in all of them not one article has been written in a kindly spirit*—no, not one. Some of them have been better tempered than others, but all of them have been written in a spirit of contumely and condescension, if they have not been coarsely abusive. The whole temper of the infidels is wrong. If we must differ, let us reason together, and not deride one another.

In a recent address (printed in *Science* for June 24, 1927) Dr. William K. Gregory, of Columbia University, took decided issue with his colleague, Dr. H. F. Osborn, regarding the descent of man from a simian ancestry. Gregory thinks he has found abundant evidence that man was once a tree-climbing animal, and harks back to the monkeys and apes. It is a great and elevating thesis to debate about! Just about as vital to human welfare as the so-called debate among the medieval scholastics about angels dancing on the point of a needle.

In the said address Dr. Gregory became merry over what he regards as a present-day "phobia." He thinks it might be called "pithecophobia, or the dread of apes—especially the dread of apes as relatives or ancestors." Then he adds: "During the past year this phobia

has become almost pandemic" (universal). Well, we wonder whether the phobia may not be of quite a different order, in spite of Gregory. We cannot think of a long Latin term to describe it, but, to our mind, it is the phobia that leads men like Gregory to dread the idea of our first parents having been created in the image of God. Perhaps it might be termed "Deophobia."

Dr. Gregory says that he and Dr. Osborn are "trying out rival prophylactic and therapeutic measures upon our patients." His method is "to inoculate the patient with the Darwinian theory of the origin of man"—that is, that he is the scion of one species of apes. On the other hand, Osborn is trying to show that man has no "close physical and mental kinship with" the simian tribes. To our mind, it does not make a mite of difference. If we believed we *were* descended from the animals, we would just as soon have a chimpanzee for our remote grandrather as a primate, which must have been an animal still further down the scale than the chimpanzee.

If one could believe in evolution at all, there are several facts in favor of man's simian ancestry that certainly do not hold in the Osbornian theory of man's descent from the primate stock. In Egypt the mummies of monkeys that lived three thousand years ago have been found. In Babylonia the remains of monkeys which lived five thousand years ago have been unearthed. Fossils of monkeys and apes have also been discovered. But not a single bone of the so-called primates has ever been discovered either in archeological or geological research. Such a creature is purely hypothetical; it has been imagined merely to uphold a theory. While there is no scientific evidence for man's evolution, yet of the two theories, that of Gregory strikes us as having more evidence in its favor than has its rival. But does not the fact that these learned evolutionists cannot agree on so vital a matter of man's lineage prove that their whole theory is mere speculation?

Our good friend, Rev. R. A. Meek, D.D., editor of the *Southern Methodist*, has corrected another error of the Modernists. They keep repeating that Protestantism substituted an infallible book for an infallible pope. That error proves once more that they are superficial students of history. The Catholic Church before the Reformation believed in the Bible as an infallible book, as did all evangelical Christians from the days of the church fathers who settled the Biblical canon. The Romanists held that the Bible was infallible, and, in addition,

they held that it required an infallible pope to interpret it correctly. The Protestant reformers denied the infallibility of the pope, but continued to hold and uphold the infallibility of the Bible. It is much to be feared that the Modernists do not study history with an unbiased mind, but twist it, as they do the Bible, to suit their own subjective views.

Our good friend, Dr. J. Gresham Machen, said some important things in his lecture trip through England last summer. On one occasion he corrected those who think it a low view of the love of God to represent Him as an angry God, "as though He were waiting coldly for a sacrifice to be made!" Then Dr. Machen says: "It is really astonishing to me how preachers of the present day, who are able to read, who have some sort of contact with the Christian literature of all the ages, should so misrepresent the Christian doctrine of the cross. . . . The very point of the Christian view of the cross is, that God does not wait for some one else to pay the price of sin, but in His infinite love has Himself paid the price of sin for us—God Himself in the person of the Son, who loved us and gave Himself for us; God Himself in the person of the Father, who so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son." Yes, that is the true doctrine of the love of God. It is a love that made an infinite sacrifice for sinful man. And that is not the superficial love of which the Modernists like to speak, but which required no sacrifice to save man from sin.

There has been a heresy trial in the Irish Presbyterian Church. Another modernist, instead of getting out of the church when he found himself out of harmony with its doctrines, has brought distress and controversy to his brethren in a whole denomination. What trouble-makers these liberalists are! This time it was Professor J. Ernest Davey, of the Presbyterian College of Belfast, who wrote a book under this title, *The Changing Vesture of the Faith*. The very wording of the title proclaims the modernism of its author. "Changing Vesture" is the *patois* of Modernism. "Thy speech betrayeth thee."

Commenting on some outspoken sayings of Dr. Minot Simons, a well-known Unitarian, the *Presbyterian* recently spoke wisely: "We admire all such liberals who, being Unitarian, refuse to eat Trinitarian bread and butter. Dr. Minot Simons sees that you cannot reject a doctrine and accept it at the same time. Thus he is outspoken on what he calls 'the irreconcilable issue among Christians.' Many shallow minds do not see that there is such an issue."

THE ARENA

Joseph McCabe's Materialism

By the Reverend William Schoeler, Independence, Oregon



IN A fourteen thousand word essay, appearing in the July-August-September (1927) number of the *Halde-man-Julius Quarterly*, Dr. Joseph McCabe, ex-priest and famous English rationalist, expatiates on what he calls "The Triumph of Materialism."

In his introduction he says that what he here presents is the fruit of fifty years "of exceptionally industrious and varied study." He will not say positively that his "little mental picture is true"; but he has "searched the fields of time and space very diligently and used every kind of guide: the theologian and the philosopher, the scientist and the historian, the poet and the essayist, the utopian and the stern economist"; and this is what he found.

"If there *were* some Bank of Eternity in which bets could be registered," he says, "I would wager a large share of my heavenly nectar and ambrosia that in a thousand years men will call this the truth about reality. It is what is commonly called Materialism."

The whole essay is disheartening and demands a reply. Let us examine what McCabe has written and see whether his interpretation of life and the universe will stand the crucible of reason.

I. Materialism and Idealism

Under this heading, while comparing the two philosophies, McCabe, although he promised not to become dogmatic, discharges a veritable broadside of dogmatic statements:

1. *There is no God.* "There is not one ripple on this material ocean that suggests a spirit breathing upon it . . . or that compels or persuades us to think of a different reality beyond it."

This, of course, is dyed-in-the-wool dogmatism. It is mere affirmation. Its force is equal to the assertion made by others, that there are thousands of ripples on this ocean of life which can never be accounted for mechanistically.

2. *Spontaneous Generation is a Fact.* On the slimy, steaming surface of the globes which roll round in the vitalizing flood from the stars, "the atoms of matter advance from combination to combination, during millions of years, until the first living specks appear."

Another dogmatic statement for which, as we shall see later, all experimental proof is lacking.

3. *"Mind is but a Function of Matter."* Back of everything is ether. This ether, in the course of time, "curdled" into matter. The heavenly bodies arose through condensation of this matter, and will ultimately dissolve again into the primordial ether that first produced them. However, "before these masses of matter, or stars, melt again into the ether from which they emerged, they somehow engender a mind in which the universe becomes conscious of itself and a heart which experiences comedy and tragedy."

McCabe here speculates, as others have speculated before his time. Sitting on the Matterhorn in 1866, Tyndall asked himself whether the primordial fog contained potentially the sadness with which, at the moment, he regarded the gnarled rocks around him. In 1874 he answered Yes, but admitted that the accepting of such a belief would necessitate our recasting of the time-honored definitions of matter and force. Just what this involves will become plain as we proceed.

4. *Conscious Life—Also Human Life—is Found on Millions of Earths That Dance in the Stream of Sunshine.* They form and dissolve, lasting a shorter or longer period, "as the accidents of time permit. Our human story is one of these monotonous chapters in the unending process of the universe."

It is apparent why McCabe makes these statements. He wants to ridicule the notion that, in all this unimaginable vastness of suns and systems, our earth alone should have brought forth life and intelligent beings. Such a belief might have been pardonable as long as Copernicus ruled in astronomy, and the earth was supposed to occupy a central position; but since the discoveries of Kepler and the revelations of the telescope, all this has changed. We now know that the earth is but an atom in the universe, and that there are a great number of planets as well fitted to be inhabited as is the globe on which we dwell. To argue that only this earth of ours is teeming with organisms is absurd.

So McCabe. But his belief is founded upon

mere theory, not upon a scientific and careful study of the facts, astronomical, physical, and biological, such as, for instance, was undertaken by the learned Alfred Russel Wallace. This distinguished scientist says in his stimulating work, *Man's Place in the Universe*, that any direct evidence in support of the view that there are more worlds than one "is almost wholly wanting, and that the greater part of the arguments are weak and flimsy in the extreme." Whereupon he proves, with logic that seems invulnerable, "that no other planet in the solar system than our earth is inhabited or habitable," and that "the probabilities are almost as great against any other sun possessing inhabited planets."

The reader will do well to peruse this thought-provoking volume. It will convince him that McCabe, once again, took things for granted which are not proven.

5. *"The Careful Study of Reality is a Hundred Years Old; and Every Single Discovery We Have Made in That Time Has Supported Materialism."*

A sweeping statement, indeed, which almost takes away one's breath! "At the outset," says McCabe, "two theories of reality, Materialism and Spiritualism, claimed attention. Every one of the millions of discoveries we have made confirms the Materialist and refutes the Spiritualist theory. That is what I call the triumph of Materialism." It is also the explanation of the title of his essay.

What McCabe wishes to imply is this: Before man delved into the secrets of nature he was a Spiritualist; but when once he learned to appreciate facts he became a Materialist. He was ignorant of the facts until a hundred years ago.

But that is absurd. Materialism dates back much further than a century. There have always been two theories of reality, and probably the cleavage will continue to the end of time. Materialism is simply the gospel of the flesh, the absolute deification of matter and the creature, traces of which pervade the whole history of mankind from Babel and Sodom onwards; nay, from the very tasting of the forbidden fruit in Paradise.

It is incorrect to say that "the careful study of reality" is turning men into Materialists. To refute this charge it is necessary merely to think of scholars like Copernicus, Kepler, Newton, Linnaeus, Cuvier, Herschel, Leibnitz, Lavoisier, Liebig, Secchi, Maedler, and scores of others that might be mentioned. Speaking by and large, men first become practical Material-

ists, and thereupon they undertake to justify their conduct by a corresponding philosophy.

6. *"If the Whole World Concluded Tomorrow That Thought and Emotion Are Mere Functions of the Brain, it Would Not Make One Iota of Practical Difference."*

When preachers and philosophers, urges McCabe, discourse on the dangers of Materialism, they don't know what they are talking about. The Materialist does not deny the value of high thoughts and emotions and the need to cultivate them. He merely denies that the popular theory of their nature is correct. Materialism is simply "an intellectual theory of the nature of reality, without any practical implications." It is not, as some erroneously regard it, "the opposite of Idealism: the absence of ideals, a gross selfishness."

But is the matter really as simple as this? McCabe says, Yes; but we are skeptical. If the whole world decided tomorrow that there is no God, that man had no soul, that there is no judgment to come, it would spell universal disaster. In spite of McCabe's vehement denial, Materialism has a moral side. It says practically to the doers of evil, "You have nothing to fear, strength wins, the race is to the swift, so take what you can." Its philosophy of life is summed up in the words: "Let us eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we die."

To McCabe and men of his type, Materialism may be simply an intellectual theory, but with the masses it would be different. They would say: "If this life is everything, and the future nothing, then a fig for high ideals and all that sort of nonsense! A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush."*

And that explains why the materialistic theory of life and the universe "is bespattered with mud in all our literature," as McCabe complains. This philosophy "of mud and dirt" has power only to drag down and to bedraggle the race; it never yet has lifted anybody to a higher level. It works harmfully; and since it works in that way, it has got into disrepute.

7. *"Our Age Improves in Proportion as Materialism Advances."* Wherefore all that preachers say and have said about the dangers of Materialism is "musty piffle" and "miserable twaddle."

This sounds rather strange, coming, as it does, from the man who, only a few paragraphs before, had assured us that his theory was absolutely "without any practical implications," and who proceeds to tell us in the next para-

graph, that Materialism "is neither an inspiration nor the extinction of an inspiration."

Much of our material advance is due to modern discoveries; but what have these discoveries to do with a man's belief or unbelief? It is absurd to insinuate, as does McCabe, that our labor-saving devices, which make it possible for us to produce wealth more rapidly than could our forbears, are the result of a turning away from the Christian religion. Why should those who believe that the mind is merely a "phosphorescence or florescence of the brain" be better qualified to make inventions than those who believe that it is a spiritual reality?

The conclusion which McCabe draws is wholly irrelevant. It is, to characterize it in his own words, "a piece of verbiage that reflects on the intellectual intelligence of every man who repeats it, a crackling of thorns under the pot."

That Materialism is not an "inspiration" we suspected long ago; but whether or not it stifles inspiration—that is another question. Too many have confessed, like Romanes, that it does. The reader may judge for himself.

But all this was merely introductory; there is much more to come. "Let's get to work," says McCabe, as he leads over to the second chapter entitled, "What is Matter?"

II. What is Matter?

1. Since it is difficult to define "spirit," McCabe argues that there is no spirit in the universe. The sense of duty, the appreciation of beauty, love, moral feeling and high thoughts and emotions are merely a function of matter, nothing more.

"It is a mere assumption," says he, "that these treasured things are spiritual; the whole deluge of rhetoric has behind it only one of the most slovenly caricatures of an intellectual process that one can imagine . . . The more enthusiastic people are 'about spiritual things,' the less able you will find them to tell you what spirit is. I invite you to try the experiment. Naturally the ordinary believer in spirituality will not be able to give you a definition of spirit, but I predict that if you approach, without giving him time to consult a dictionary, one of those eloquent apostles of or emphatic writers on spirituality and ask for a definition of spirit, you will not get one."

It may be readily granted that it is hard to define spirit. But it does not on that account follow that spirit does not exist. Nobody doubts that life exists; but who has ever adequately defined it? In this case, too, it might turn out that the more enthusiastic people are

about "living their lives," the less able you will find them to give a definition of life. But perhaps the men who have studied the matter and written books about life can provide a definition? Suppose we consult a few at random, to see what reply they will make:

Spiller: "Life, in the widest sense of the word, is motion or change of place." A rather wide definition, indeed!

Hæckel: "Life is the direct action of the existent substance of the individual." Is this really a definition?

Bernard: "The vital principle is that which makes the plants grow." Yes; and that which makes the plants grow is life!

Hartman: "A requirement for the vital development is that 'the metaphysical subject of the plan of evolution' be itself immanent in the process as instrument of the intentional development according to fixed laws." As clear as a London fog!

Schopenhauer: "Life is will." Whose?

And so on! If we were not alive ourselves and observed life on every hand, we might, from these definitions, conclude that possibly there was no such a thing as life—that the conception of life was due to the "most slovenly caricature of an intellectual process that one can imagine!"*

2. McCabe next asserts that it really does not matter at all whether "love and duty are quantitative or non-quantitative realities," or whether or not there is any spirit. "The only issue of any real importance or interest is, not whether the mind is material or spiritual, but whether it is mortal or immortal."

The argument is somewhat confused. If the mind is merely a phosphorescence of the brain, it ceases to exist when the brain stops functioning—in other words, it is *eo ipso*, mortal. On the other hand, if mind is a spiritual entity, it may be, though it does not necessarily follow, that it is immortal. Consequently it is of immense importance whether or not the mind is material, and whether or not "love and duty" and all our high thoughts and emotions are spiritual qualities or merely molecular tremors.

3. According to McCabe, the only reality which has any existence is matter; and he forthwith begins to analyze it in the following way: The ultimate substance is ether; and the visible universe is but a "curdling of ether." "The chemist reduces all material combinations to ninety-two elements or types of atoms; the

*Dr. McCabe believes in the reality of *Matter*. He might well be challenged, then, to define *Matter*, and thus take a dose of his own medicine.—*Editor*.

physicist shows that the ninety-two different atoms are simply larger or smaller clusters of electrons and protons."

Thus the universe, in the last analysis, consists of "two different material units, electrons and protons," which have been "weighed and measured," and the electrons and protons were developed from the ether. This being a fact, "Materialism has completely triumphed in astronomy. We have wiped out all traces of that 'finger of God' which was formerly supposed to be clearly seen in the heavens."

Such is McCabe's logic. But will it stand the test of reason? The argument is this: as long as the universe seemed to be compacted of a great number of different materials, a Creator may have been necessary; but now that we know it to be composed of only two fundamental elements, a Maker is no longer required. It just happened!

In order that the "slovenliness" of this reasoning (?) may be duly appreciated, let us look at it in the light of a few illustrations.

We believed a great poem or drama to be a complicated product, requiring a genius to compose it; but that was all nonsense. The ordinary man, the "chemist," may think it consists of a great number of elements, say "ninety-two"; but the grammarian, that is to say, the "physicist," knows better. He shows that, in the last analysis, our drama is made up of sentences, which consist of subject and predicate; and that these two root-forms of speech are merely a "curdling" of words! It is, therefore, seen to be simplicity itself. The words formed the sentences, the sentences the paragraphs, and the paragraphs arranged themselves in such a way as to make our drama!

We thought a musical composition required a mind to create it; but we know better today. On analyzing the Fifth Symphony we find that even the complicated passages can be resolved into tone-units. *Ergo*: those tone-units grouped themselves together spontaneously; we were mistaken in believing that the composition was designed by a master mind.

We stood enraptured before a piece of fabric, marveling at the wonderful patterns wrought into its warp and woof; but along comes a sly fellow and explains to us that, in the last analysis, that so-called piece of art really consists of a single thread!

We believed the world of organic creatures, both vegetable and animal, to be indefinitely complex and enchanting, worthy of a God; but the microscope reveals that every living thing consists of cells, and that at the core of each cell there is a naked mass of bioplasm which,

to all the tests known to man, appears to be the same in the animal and in the plant, in the sponge and in the brain. Thus what seemed to be complex at first is now explained. The various forms of life are merely aggregates of cells!

McCabe, no doubt, will accuse me of frivolity. He will ridicule my figures as not analogous. But they are! nor am I frivolous. On the contrary, I am in a very serious mood. This universe, says McCabe, is reducible to ninety-two different elements; the ninety-two elements, in turn, can be resolved into two basic units, the electrons and the protons; and the electrons and protons, very likely, are merely curdled ether. *Ergo*, a God is superfluous. All things created themselves.

What Materialism does not explain, has never explained, and never will explain, is the co-ordination or adjustment of part to part, both in the organic and the inorganic universe. Are we to believe that the plan of the universe is contained in the gases, the fluids and the solids of which the universe consists? Are we to imagine that the plan of the body is produced by its food? Then it is also true that the plan of a microscope is contained in the glass and the metals that are used in its construction! Materialism introduces design without a Designer, order without an Ordainer, harmony without a Harmonizer. It defends the dicer's theory of the universe.

That God, out of such simple substances as protons and electrons, should have created this wonderful universe with its millions of kinds of organisms is, to me, even more remarkable than if He had used a great many complex elements. For the world I cannot understand how the fact that the ninety-two elements, which apparently make up this physical universe, are reducible to two fundamental types, shall rule God out of existence. In my humble opinion He is now all the more necessary as Designer and Maker.

4. McCabe continues: "That this is the real nature of electrons and protons has been held by many distinguished scientists for years, but it is by no means proved."

The latter part of the sentence is a fatal admission. Still, McCabe is sure that the picture of the universe as drawn by him will be "the science of the future. . . The ultimate reality will prove to be ether, in which arise (and back into which may possibly dissolve) the little centers we call electrons and protons." And as regards these fundamental types, "a prominent scientist suggested long ago that

they might be minute vortices or whirlpools in ether, one revolving to the right, the other to the left, thus explaining positive and negative electricity."

McCabe says in the introduction to his essay that, despite appearances, he has a sense of humor. He undoubtedly has; for I cannot believe that he meant the foregoing to be anything but a joke. If the problematical vortices or whirlpools in the ether account for positive and negative electricity, perhaps they will also account for the fact that some plants, like beans, wind round their poles from right to left, while others grow from left to right!

McCabe's "prominent" scientist has explained nothing; he has merely increased the mystery. Men are always trying to explain things which they understand but imperfectly by things which they do not understand at all.

5. One more point in connection with this second chapter: McCabe concludes: "Many physicists (he should have said *most* physicists) define matter as that which possesses inertia, or does not move until it is moved. This is not an essential definition. A billiard ball will not move until it is pushed. But when we try to work out this in regard to protons, electrons and ether, we find ourselves checked by the scantiness of our knowledge."

McCabe admits that, wherever we can experiment on matter, we find it to be inert; but he insists that it may not be inert where we cannot experiment. This is a procedure which is wholly unwarranted. If matter is just matter and inert wherever it is possible to experiment on it, then, according to all the laws of analogy and uniformity, we must suppose it to be inert also where we cannot experiment on it. At any rate, the Vitalists have a right to consider protons and electrons as inert until Materialists have furnished the proof that they are not.

There is no God in the universe, says McCabe, because we have searched through it from end to end and not found Him. The molecules and the atoms, the protons and the electrons and ether are all material and occupy space. A spiritual reality is not to be discovered anywhere.

This is McCabe's argument; but what does it prove? You say the basic units of this scheme of things are all material? So are the threads from which your wonderful fabric is woven. But who co-ordinated those threads? You say you have taken all the threads apart and not discovered any weaver? It was to be expected that you would not find him. It was absurd to look for him between the threads.

III. The Supposed Vital Principle

In introducing this chapter, McCabe says: "No one ever went so far as to claim that matter had been dissolved into spirit or something that was not material." Thereupon he ridicules the position of those "who hold that the energies or movements of a living thing are due to the presence in it of an immaterial something which they call 'the vital principle,'"

To McCabe, life is simply a chemical process, a mechanical adjustment; and he is sure that the progress of science has favored, not the Vitalists, but the Materialists. The religious apologists who still discuss "certain controversies (such as the origin of life and the evolution of species) which were settled long ago," do not know what they are talking about. We shall, as before, follow McCabe's outline.

1. *The Spontaneous Origin of Life and the Natural Evolution of Species.*

"There is no serious controversy today," says our author, "about the origin of life. Much dust is raised about it by the more ignorant apologetic writers," but "the authorities are agreed that the first living things came upon the earth by natural evolution." The only opposition to this fact, he insists, comes from men who rely upon a disputed interpretation of Genesis, which he calls a Babylonian myth.

Let us approach this question with an open mind and ascertain what is the real situation. If all the authorities are agreed (which is not true) that life arose upon the earth by natural evolution, they are likewise agreed in admitting that this wonderful process has never been observed to occur. Both the Outline of Science and the Encyclopedia Britannica say outright that there is "no evidence of spontaneous generation"; they say that "it can now be stated definitely that all known living organisms arise only from pre-existing living organisms."

But McCabe really didn't want to say that the authorities "know" that life originated by "natural" evolution, as one might, at first blush, be led to believe. In the next paragraph he qualifies his statement to the effect that "scientific men and all who consult their common sense *assume* that the earliest living things were evolved from inorganic matter."

That is better. It comes nearer the truth. Still the implication, that such as may be of a different mind are devoid of common sense is somewhat uncharitable.

Why do scientific men "assume" the spon-

taneous origin of the earliest living things? McCabe replies: "We have only two possible modes of origin: creation or evolution." His authorities reject creation as unthinkable, and therefore believe in natural evolution as the more rational alternative. They admit that all known organisms arise from pre-existing organisms; they admit that there is no direct evidence that spontaneous generation ever occurred; they admit that no man ever succeeded in making a living thing; but unless the earliest forms of life were naturally evolved, a pet theory in philosophy must be given up. This would be terrible. Therefore, in order to save the theory, they "assume" that, in the complex conditions existing billions of years ago when our earth was in the making, a life-germ may have been produced by a fortuitous concourse of atoms!

This is not science, as any man with common sense can see, but romanticism gone to seed. But to continue. All the higher forms of life, says McCabe, were evolved from the lower; so it is legitimate to "assume that the earliest things themselves were evolved from inorganic matter unless there is some intrinsic impossibility. No one has ever shown any."

But it is not true that it is "now certain that all the higher forms of life were evolved from the lower." That is a mere dogmatic statement; for the species is fixed. The species indeed possesses a certain plasticity or adaptability; but this adaptability has its limits. It is a lessening quantity as descendants are farther and farther removed from their original progenitors. The more any descendant varies from its progenitor, the weaker is it, and the more likely to revert. Even Haeckel distinguishes between what he calls a "good species" and a mere nominal species. The skill of man has so far produced only "nominal" species, that is to say, varieties which can be called species only by courtesy. McCabe's premise has no leg to stand on; and the conclusion which he draws from his unproved premise fares as badly.

But suppose it were true—suppose it were a fact that all the higher forms of life had evolved from the lower—would McCabe's inference, that all "the earliest living things themselves were evolved from inorganic matter," be legitimate?

By no means. And why not? Because there is more in McCabe's conclusion than in his premise. All the known living forms of organisms, great and small, arise from antecedent life; we never observe an exception; when, therefore, McCabe affirms that the earliest

things evolved naturally from inorganic matter, he not only outruns, but contradicts, experience.

The Christian who believes in the Genesis story—which we do not admit, as McCabe charges, to be "an ancient Babylonian guess"—is much more rational, much more scientific. He, too, believes that once upon a time the organic world sprang up from the inorganic; but he does not say that this occurred "naturally." It is against all the laws of nature that the non-living should bring forth the living. Accordingly the Christian believes, with the author of Genesis, that life is the result of a divine fiat.

There is a very simple way by which the materialist can prove that life arose from the rock-crystal naturally—let him simply produce life in the laboratory! But even if this should be done—which seems very unlikely—it would by no means disprove the teaching of Moses and the prophets. In the laboratory there is a directing *Mind*; and it is just this directing *Mind* that McCabe believes he can dispense with. For the chemist to prove that spontaneous generation is a fact, it would be necessary to show that life develops "naturally" in the retort, or upon "the steaming beaches of mud and sand," where only chemical and physical laws are in operation.

"In a thousand years," affirms McCabe, men will call his philosophy "the truth about reality." He might as well have said in a million years; for his philosophy is against the nature of things. The nature of things is so grandly in harmony with the Genesis story that, as long as men "consult their common sense," the Mosaic account will be read with wonderment and deep-felt reverence.

2. *The Vital Principle.*

McCabe rejects the existence of a vital principle, (1) because nobody seems to know "where it comes from"; (2) because so many different names have been given to it; (3) because, to his way of looking at the matter, it "brings in far more serious problems than it pretends to solve."

(a) McCabe speaks the truth when he says that not all the men who call themselves Vitalists believe in a personal God. But that is really an argument for the "Spiritualist" instead of for the Materialist. It proves that religion is not always "back of these things"! Merciless logic compels these men, even though they are not theists, to look for the life-principle *beyond* matter, since it is against all reason to regard it as a sprouting of matter.

(b) In respect to the different names given to this vital principle and to the fact that its exponents now call themselves "Neo-Vitalists" in distinction from the "Vitalists" of a hundred years ago, it is hard to see why this should prove a stumbling-block to accepting the theory. That the Vitalists of today do not wish to be confused with the early Vitalists is a fact easy to appreciate. When those pioneers maintained that, in the forming of an organism, chemical and physical forces played no part at all, they were most certainly mistaken. Physical forces are moving through the organism; it would be foolish to deny this. But, say the Neo-Vitalists, the physical forces are not the sole, or the prime, agents at work. The prime agent is life.

But this attitude is characterized by McCabe as "building upon our ignorance." In his opinion there is "only one valid argument for dragging in a vital principle, namely, that there is something in the life of an organism which the physical and chemical properties cannot explain." He denies, however, that there is such a "something." In his estimation there is nothing in the organism "beyond the gases and earths which compose its body and the chemical and physical properties of those elements." The Materialist can afford to wait till the contrary has been proved.

Well, the Vitalist can also afford to wait. In affirming that there is *no* vital principle the Materialist becomes as dogmatic as the Vitalist who says there *is*, with this difference: the Vitalist stands upon the fact that mere chemical forces never produce life, whereas the Materialist stands beside them. If we are what we eat, as said Feuerbach, and the body has its origin in its food, why try to convert the world by writing books? Why not simply prescribe a certain course of diet?

When we see the bioplasts weaving their threads, and co-ordinating them, so as in the one case to make a swallow, in the other an eagle, and in still another a lion, we know that there must be forecast somewhere. But forecast is not a property of matter. It is getting too late to say that mere molecular arrangement accounts for the metamorphosis of the non-living into the living, and for the weaving of the living into the complexity of the tissues in millions of organic forms. McCabe, resolved on explaining the mystery, is forced to admit that "we do not in the least understand" how, for instance, "an oak tree or a peacock is built out of a microscopic germ. . . . The ultimate processes, even in the assimilation of

food, the contraction of muscles, or the action of nerves, are still obscure."

Yes; and it would seem that McCabe ought to learn his lesson. Yet he doesn't. "But how in the name of all that is wonderful," he exclaims, "does that discredit Materialism? We have learned how to explain thirty things out of fifty, and the explanation is purely mechanical. Surely the common-sense conclusion is that the mechanical explanation of the thirty is a triumph for Materialism, and it gives us some confidence that we shall yet explain the other twenty."

Of course, the numbers twenty and thirty are quite arbitrarily taken; they are not based upon exact research. It would seem to be much nearer the truth to say that for every discovery which we make a hundred new mysteries appear, and that, looking broadly at the situation, we cannot "explain" one thing in a thousand.

(c) The theory of the vital principle, urges McCabe in the third place, "brings in far more serious problems than it pretends to solve. . . . Has this something else a plan of what it has to build? Does it communicate this to the atoms of matter? Does it direct the atoms into place. . . . Would not the vital principle of even the lowest microbe, which is supposed to do what all the science of our time can not do—make a living cell—be a greater thing than the mind of an Edison?"

It is either the atoms composing the microbe that weave the tissues of the microbe, or some power back of it. Those who reject the existence of a power back of it make the microbe itself a greater wonder than the mind of an Edison, for it does what that wizard is incapable of doing.

McCabe's whole chapter on "The Supposed Vital Principle" is extremely unconvincing. Nevertheless, he concludes it with the bold statement: "The mechanical principle has so far made all the discoveries we have made, and we have no positive reason for supposing that there are any processes of the living thing that it will not in time explain." All of which is a gratuitous assumption.

IV. The Human Machine

In the chapter by the above title Mr. McCabe tries to prove that man is only a machine, and that all his activity, both mental and physical, can be explained on purely mechanical lines. Let us consider his points in the order presented.

1. *Instincts in Animals.*

McCabe admits that there are "a great many

instincts in animals that we cannot explain." Still he insists that "instinctive behavior is as automatic as the lifting of your hand when a speck of dust brushes against your eye or the budding of trees in the spring: the animal receives a certain stimulation, and it reacts to this by movements of its muscles as automatically as a plant grows round an obstacle."

Yes; but how did instinct originate? And how is it transmitted from one generation to another? It has been observed, for instance, that the larva of the male stag-beetle, on becoming a chrysalis, constructs a larger case than it needs to contain its curled-up body. Why? Horns will presently make their appearance, and they also must find room! What does the larva know of its future form of existence? To what sort of material "stimulus" does it react when it arranges its house? It is only the blindness of prejudice, as Dreisch points out, which can deny that, in the vital phenomena of organic things, we have more than the result of mechanical action. Has McCabe ever studied Driesch? We highly recommend that author to him.

2. *The Human Machine.*

McCabe finds the human body "full of these (automatic) mechanisms like any other body, though in our case intelligence has generally superseded instinct." Our eating and drinking, the assimilation of food and the ejection of refuse, our seeing and hearing; yes, and also our thinking, are merely a "series of mechanisms at work," though "nerve is more difficult to understand than muscle or gland," and nerve-stuff in the brain "is the most complicated matter in the universe."

In a word, man is merely a machine, according to our author. A complicated machine, to be sure; but a machine, nevertheless. All the motivations of man's life are mechanistic. "The working of the forces inherent in his organism is altered just as mechanically as we can alter the combination of chemicals."

What is the truth here? The truth is that man has both a physical and a spiritual side. Physically he is mechanistic, but whose is the control and whose the purpose? Machines must be directed; otherwise they cannot function. These man-made machines (even chemical machines), which McCabe borrows for his parallel, are singularly powerless when left to their own devices. Man bears toward all of them, however intricate they may be, the relation of providence. How is McCabe operated—that is, McCabe, the *machine*? What controls and motivates him when he takes his pen

in hand to write an essay like the present one? Can machines think? Can they reason? Can they repair or reproduce themselves? Imagine a soulless McCabe, with the utmost ingenuity, demonstrating to soulless readers that they have no souls! Is he not contradicted by every word he writes, since he addresses his arguments to the *minds* of his readers and not to their muscles or glands?

McCabe avows that he is nothing but a machine. He looks at a sunset or a flower, and receives, *via* the machine's equipment for seeing, an impression which produces a molecular disturbance in the gray matter of his brain; and this perturbation or palpitation of the brain is recognized by the machine as an impression of beauty, capable of being reproduced at any time the machine may desire. Does McCabe know of any other machine, among the many marvelous mechanisms that man has fashioned, which has similar powers and intelligence?

The wisest authority in Materialism is unable to explain what is a mental impression, or how, for instance, the feeling for beauty or the sense of duty is actually secreted in the brain. Is there any hope that we shall ever be able to recognize the simplest idea—as that of a tree, flower or stone—as a chemical element, or as a combination of such elements, in mere brain-stuff?

3. *Experimental Embryology.*

Reflecting on the building of a human body in a woman's womb, Mr. McCabe admits that it is still a great mystery—that, in spite of Mendelist science, "it is futile to say that we are appreciably nearer understanding how a germ creates a body." But he is sure that the findings of what he calls "experimental embryology" confirm the Materialistic and not the Vitalistic viewpoint.

What is meant by "experimental embryology"? Generally a female ovum does not begin to split up and form a body until a male cell enters and blends with it. But of late some remarkable discoveries have been made. It was found that, in not a few instances, fathers are not necessary. If the female ovum of some of the lower animals is pricked with a needle or irritated by certain chemicals, the egg begins to develop exactly as if it had been impregnated by a male. In this way fatherless sea-urchins, worms, and even frogs have been reared; and men are beginning to wonder whether it may yet be possible to produce this result also in the human ovum. The fact that, in the cases cited, fathers are not necessary,

McCabe construes to the triumph of Materialism.

The logic of this argument, it seems to us, is somewhat awry. In the case of the fatherless creatures mentioned by McCabe, the starting-point was the egg, and not some inorganic substance. That reproduction without the union of parents of distinct sexes is possible (agamogenesis) has been known for many years. Among our common honey-bees drones develop from the eggs of the queen, if the egg has not been fructified; a female, a queen, or a working-bee, if the egg was fructified. It is not contrary to the laws of nature that perfect individuals may be virginally born. There are numberless such examples. But how this can be made to support Materialism it is hard to see. It was, if memory serves us, the Materialist and not the Christian who used to maintain that in the origin of life two parents are *always* necessary. The Christian, believing as he does in the Virgin Birth of Christ, never admitted that this law was universal without exception. It is to be hoped that henceforth Materialists will desist from describing the Virgin Birth as a physical impossibility. That is all we can make of McCabe's argument.

Dwelling on the fact that the milk in a mother's breast is ready just when it is needed, McCabe says we used to consider this quite wonderful; but the coincidence is already being explained. The milk appears "just when it is needed because the foetus secretes and passes into the mother's blood a certain chemical which stimulates her milk-glands. In every department of the body we are finding such mechanisms, and there are few physiologists in the world who will now admit that a 'vital principle' is needed or would explain anything if we admitted it."

How simple! We now know why the organ gives forth melody at the very time that the bellows are manipulated. The motions of the keys and the pulsations of sound correspond exactly with the currents of air which the bellows throw into the pipes! Will McCabe kindly tell us, first, how the foetus comes to generate that remarkable chemical, and, secondly, by what canny insight it holds it in suspense against the very day it is needed?

If man were a mere machine, it would be impossible to explain why he shrinks from the thought of death. What machine does McCabe have in mind, or what chemical combination, whose attitude toward the sledge of the wrecker—who may indeed but contemplate another and a better device—is the attitude of man toward physical extinction? All in all,

McCabe speaks idly and to little purpose. In the sight of Providence he plays with mysteries he cannot fathom, as the children of the Boer farmer played with the pebble that was in truth a diamond.

V. The Mystery of Consciousness

1. With this division we come upon the very heart of the controversy. Mr. McCabe introduces it by reiterating that the physiologist by his research "has explained the greater part of the body as the functioning of a system of mechanisms," and that therefore "he has every logical reason to believe that the remaining obscurities will be cleared upon mechanical lines."

But he does not want the reader to misunderstand him when he compares the body to a machine. He does not mean a machine in the ordinary sense, that is, "a steel or aluminum or copper machine," but rather a co-ordinated material structure, its various parts working in harmony, but of such very different material from rigid metals that its action depends essentially on the chemical changes in its elements."

Quite a machine, that! Far from explaining the mystery, McCabe merely describes results. He speaks of "co-ordinated material structure," but does not tell us why the material is co-ordinated; he says the "various parts work in harmony," but the *cause* of this harmony he fails to indicate.

McCabe believes that, in the course of time, it "will be amply proved" that the brain produces thought as the liver produces bile. The whole process is automatic. Thought consists in the motion of matter; it is a translocation of the cerebral substance. The nervous system reacts to external stimulation.

But the whole theory that mind is merely a function of the brain reacting to external stimulation is exploded by the simple fact that one can, even under the influence of the most violent irritation of the senses, pursue a line of thought which stands in no kind of connection with the outside world. Furthermore, if mind were what McCabe declares it to be, sensuous perception ought necessarily and in all instances to call forth intelligent thought. Yet everybody knows that this is not the case.

And how can the Materialist explain dream-life, memory, or the sense of personal identity? It is very significant that McCabe slurs over these weighty matters. Every seven years, the books used to say; every six months, they say now, the flux of the particles of the living tissues carries away all that is material in the

entire system; there is nothing of the old body left, after that brief span of time, but the plan of the organism; yet man retains both his memory and his identity unabated. How is this possible if memory is so bound up with the brain that the former is but a function or secretion of the latter? If the cause is taken away, must not the effect disappear likewise?

As I write these paragraphs it is raining, and a beautiful rainbow has formed upon the cloudy sky. The clouds are perpetually changing their shapes, but the rainbow remains fixed. What is the cause of the rainbow? "The clouds!" says McCabe; "the rainbow is the function of the clouds." "No!" reply the philosophers; "the clouds cannot be the cause, for they change position and the rainbow remains fixed where it is. If the clouds were the *cause* of the rainbow, the rainbow would move with the motions of the clouds. The clouds are merely the *occasion* of the rainbow; the *cause* is in the sun, which is not in flux, but fixed."

This illustrates the relation of the mind to the body, or of thought to the brain, and the difference of viewpoint between the Materialists and the Spiritualists. The unity of consciousness in man implies that there is somewhere within him a substance which does not change, in which memory and the plan of the whole organism inhere.

2. McCabe proceeds: "Mind is either a function of the brain or it is the activity of something which, though bound up with the brain, is not material." Quite so. But McCabe insists: "By all the rules of logic and common sense, we are bound to assume that it is a function of the brain until proof is given that it can not be such."

Here let the reader mark the word "assume." McCabe employs it because Mr. Loeb had pressed him to admit that it was by no means "proved that mind is a function of the brain or explained consciousness as such." We see, accordingly, that when McCabe says "the brain produces thought as surely as the liver produces bile," he gives us, not the findings of science, but his own private opinion, where the wish is father to the thought!

It will repay us to examine a little more closely the connection between brain and thought. In the brain there are two kinds of fibres called the automatic and influential arcs; and we know that the contrast between these two portions of the brain is as marked as that between their accepted scientific names.

Investigation has brought out the fact that

certain parts of the brain, namely, the automatic portion, may be electrically stimulated so as to produce muscular contraction which can, with precision, be foretold by the experimenter. But electrical stimulation of the higher or frontal lobes of the brain, which by common consent are the seat of the intellect, produces no result in the frame whatsoever.

This is in itself a discovery which amounts to a demonstration, proving that the mind has control of this portion of the brain. But its significance is enhanced by another discovery of even higher import. Should the experimenter take away one entire hemisphere of the brain, motion and sensation disappear at once upon the opposite side of the body; but all the mental powers remain intact! Half of the brain can be removed, paralyzing half of the physical functions, but the mind may, without abatement of its powers, continue all its operations with completeness. The sense of personal identity remains unimpaired, and so does memory.

Professor Ferrier, an authority in these matters, says: "When one hemisphere is removed or destroyed by disease, motion and sensation are abolished unilaterally, but mental operations are still capable of being carried on in their completeness through the agency of the one hemisphere."

The language here is significant. Mental operations, according to this scientist, are performed "through the agency" of the brain; they are not simply functions of the brain itself. If they were, those functions, of necessity, would be co-extensive with the brain's physiological activity; which they are not.

When the brain to be operated on is small a certain diminution of *vigor* in mental action may follow the taking away of a hemisphere; but in a large brain this effect can hardly be noticed. But even if it were perceptible in every instance, it would prove nothing for the Materialist. Take away from your two-banked organ one whole bank, and the music proceeding from it is less powerful; but all the notes and rhythm remain. In the brain is your anthem in the keys or in the musician's mind?

The brain is but an instrument upon which the mind plays—"an agency through which mental operations are carried on"; if it were otherwise, one side could not be conceived to be taken away without the other side disappearing likewise. But, we repeat it for emphasis, half of the brain may be taken away, and yet the mind can perform with completeness all its operations.

3. When philosophers like Eucken, continues McCabe, are asked to prove that there is a spiritual reality, they offer only the "vague claims that the world of ideas and emotions which we perceive through our consciousness is of a 'different order,' or on a 'different plane,' from the world of material realities. One set of realities is 'qualitative' and the other is 'quantitative.'" The philosophers will have it that the material world can be weighed and measured, while to the mental acts no material standard applies. But this argument, McCabe thinks, is silly. In his opinion "thoughts and emotions are of a different or qualitative order only in the sense that we have not yet *proved* them to be quantitative."

It is to be feared that McCabe will have to wait a long, long time before anybody will succeed in proving that mental acts are quantitative—a long, long time before men will ascribe extension, inertia, gravity, color or form to a thought, an imagination, a choice or an emotion.

Let us see how it works. When Tolstoy composed the Kreutzer Sonata, did his imagination weigh an ounce or a pound? When Peter, quailing at the look of Christ, went out into the night weeping over his sin, was his grief round, square or triangular? When Newton discovered the law of gravitation, was his thought red, brown or violet? When Lot chose the Plain of the Jordan, was his choice hexagonal or octagonal? And so on.

The mere asking of these questions is enough to show how untenable is McCabe's position. The terms which we apply to matter are wholly inapplicable and absurd when used to describe the world of ideas. Why? Because ideas are not material; they belong in a class by themselves.

4. Our unbeliever now submits, as he thinks, a most difficult question to the Spiritualists. He would like to know, if they are right, "why each particular collection of ideas and emotions—mine and yours—begin twenty or fifty years ago, and just when, as witnesses tell us, the brain began, and made progress in clearness and efficiency just as the brain made progress."

This is not a difficult question at all. The different spiritual faculties, though potentially present in the original plan, are only brought into activity by experience. Suppose we compare the brain to a loom, and the soul to the weaver. There must be a loom before a web can be woven, and there must be something to weave. But, as we saw before, even this is not enough. Besides the loom and the something

to weave, there must be a weaver to co-ordinate the threads.

It is so in the case of the soul: there must be a brain before it can come into contact with the exterior world, and there must be experiences before it can effect anything for philosophy. As the loom, under the guidance of the weaver, co-ordinates thread with thread until the fabric is woven, so the brain, as the organ of the soul, turns mere sense-perceptions into ideas and emotions. The sense-perceptions are one thing; the capability of evolving them into rational thought is quite another thing. As little as the web is a function of the loom, is thought a function of the brain; and as little as we dare confuse the weaver with the waterfall that drives the loom, dare we confuse the mind with the food-materials which, in the body, are transformed into physical and chemical force. This brings us to McCabe's final argument.

5. It was shown in the late war, says he, "that a dose of acid sodium phosphate enormously increased a man's vitality." Only the Materialist, according to McCabe, can give an adequate explanation of this phenomenon: "mind is a function of the body; so this intimate connection is natural."

One does not know whether to remain serious or become amused over this supposed argument. It may be readily admitted that "a dose of acid sodium phosphate" develops chemical force in the human body; for every kind of food that goes into the human system does the same. But what of it? Does this even tend to prove that the Materialist philosophy is right?

In his blindness the Materialist confuses the water which drives the loom with the weaver who co-ordinates the movements of the shuttles; he confuses the wind that swells the sails of a boat with the rower who sets the oars in motion! When will Materialists learn that the chemical forces at work in an organism must be as rigorously distinguished from life as the unintelligent forces of the waterfall or the steam are distinguished from the weaver?

What man would be so foolish as to deny that, when a greater quantity of water is poured upon the wheels, the motions of the loom are accelerated? What man would be so simple-minded as to deny that, when sails are set up in a boat, and the wind swells those sails, the rower makes swifter progress? But who would affirm that the wind that swells the sails is analogous to the force that manipulates the oars? Yet this is McCabe's argument

In the concluding remarks of this chapter Mr. McCabe says: "We are told usually that the relation of mind and brain is like that of a musician and his instrument. There is, even in the spiritualist hypothesis, not the slightest analogy. The musician is distinct from the instrument and works it by physical contact. If you say that it is the *mind* of the musician which works it, you simply come back to the starting point: is mind a spiritual reality, or do you really mean that the musician's *brain* plays the instrument?"

Suppose we come back, then, to the starting-point. What do we know of the brain? We know that it is wholly material, and as such incapable of originating its own activities. Physical forces play through its convolutions and initiate tremors; but those tremors are not thoughts; they do not sing or reason until modulated by the ineffable touches of the mind. It is true that the musician works his instrument by physical contact, as says McCabe; but it is the will of the musician that directs the movements of his fingers. We cannot throw a Beethoven into the air unless we seat a musician at the keys.

VI. Determinism and Morals

In this concluding chapter McCabe does two things—he denies the free will of man, and affirms that the preaching of this doctrine, instead of demoralizing the world, will make for improvement and progress.

1. "Most of our actions are automatic," he says.

This may be accepted when modified to read that a great many of our actions are automatic. The lifting of the hand when a speck of dust gets into the eye, or the rubbing of the knee after knocking it against an object, is done automatically. The will has nothing to do with these motions. The muscles function quite independently in response to external stimulation.

But suppose we decide *not* to rub the knee after striking it against an object—what then? Is this action automatic, too? That it is possible, by the will, to restrain the hand from rubbing the knee everybody knows. The Spartans, by sheer force of will-power, endured the most excruciating pain without winking an eyelid. Automatic?

When a man, says McCabe, decides to go to town in a street car instead of by automobile, or when he decides to spend five dollars on selfish pleasures instead of buying a present for his wife, though he thinks there is no com-

pulsion, he nevertheless acts as he does automatically.

It is hard to follow McCabe in such reasoning. Might not the man have gone to town either way? Might he not, instead of "visiting a young lady," have entertained his wife? There was no irresistible compulsion. He *chose* to do what he did, and he knows himself to be responsible.

But, urges McCabe, "the strongest motive wins in a struggle. You may say, just to prove your freedom, that you will choose the alternative which seems to you less attractive; but you have merely thrown into the scale a new motive."

This is sophistry. It is darkening the issue with words. Mark well: the man, by McCabe's own admission, decides to do the less attractive. Still, according to McCabe, the action was automatic for the reason that a new motive, outbalancing the alternative motive, was thrown into the scale. But who threw that motive into the scale? Why, the man himself. He brought his will-power into play. What he did he did from *choice*, and he *knows* it. To call such an action automatic is changing the meaning of the term.

There are times when we all hear a still small voice within us saying, "I ought!" If we suffer from a mere defect in our intellectual or physical organization, we do not blame ourselves; but the moment we violate a command of conscience, uttered in this whispered "I ought!" we do blame ourselves. There is therefore a difference between a moral and a non-moral act.

Man either has the power of choice or he has not. If he has the power of choice, he is responsible for his actions, and the prospect of a jail-sentence or the gallows may deter him from crime; if he lacks the power of choice and is merely a molecular machine, punishment is futile.

McCabe seems to feel that he is standing on very thin ice, as witness the following admission: "I do not want the reader to imagine that all is clear as noonday in this matter of free will. Every man of strong vitality is conscious of what a modern psychologist has called a 'power of self-orientation.' Henley's lines:

'I am the master of my fate,
I am the captain of my soul,'

or Shakespeare's 'I'll take up arms against a sea of trouble,' express something that is within our experience. It does not imply free will in the old sense, for that would mean an uncaused act. What precisely it does mean, and

how this seeming power of self-determination has been evolved in an automatic world, are questions of the psychology of the future."

It is hard to wrestle with the nature of things and win! Henley's lines and those of Shakespeare's are true to experience; McCabe's philosophy is in conflict with experience. The power of self-determination is not only "seeming," but real. We are as sure of it as we are of our own existence. Nor is it correct to call our world an "automatic" world. It is not altogether automatic. To call it such is putting a part for the whole.

2. McCabe, of course, believes in what is known as the Materialistic determination of history. He is sure that "modern history is a massive application of the Materialistic principle. Environment is used on every page as the clue to historical development."

He grants that the ideas of great men like Franklin, Paine, Jefferson, Washington,* Marx, Mussolini, etc., must be admitted as factors in shaping the history of a nation and of the world; but here again, in his opinion, the question arises "whether or not ideas and plans are material realities." Since McCabe believes that they are, the case, as far as he is concerned, is closed.

Anybody who can underwrite such an idea is welcome to it. Ideas and plans material realities! Perhaps the chemist of the future will be able to bottle them up! All that is necessary is to invent the proper apparatus in which they can be reduced to a fluid! Now get busy, all ye who have faith in the venture! There are millions in it!

To McCabe's charge, which he repeats in this chapter, that the world has made progress in proportion as men have adopted Materialism as their pole-star, we can only reply that it is not true. Not all the discoveries and inventions were made by those who regard man as merely a chemical machine. Materialists and Spiritualists alike have profited, socially and economically, by the inventions given to the world through genius. It is ridiculous to insinuate, as does McCabe, that the Materialists alone are in favor of recreation, education, sanitation, good homes and good clothes. Spiritualists use these things as well as do the Materialists. But creature comforts in themselves are neither moral nor immoral. They may be used for moral or immoral purposes. And here is where the danger lurks in the Materialistic philosophy.

Tell a man that he is nothing but a beast without a future, organized for the enjoyment

of his present existence, and where is the incentive to do right? "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die!" Of what good is my fellow-man to me? To be my slave, to give me pleasure! Materialism simply means the reign of the stronger over the weaker. It whispers to the tyrant, "You have nothing to fear!" The strongest motive wins; and it is right that it should win. It is the glorification of the Superman who laughs at the moral code.

The present essay by Mr. McCabe, by all odds, is the most unconvincing one he has ever written. It fairly bristles with inconsistencies. Before Materialism can be said to have triumphed, it must invent an entirely new terminology. The terminology employed by McCabe is largely spiritualistic throughout. He is comparable to the man who looks for spots in the sun, but who could not see the spots except for the light which the sun itself provides.

* * *

"Extreme views get a hearing quicker, but the careful, discriminating view has more power to spread and to remain." Yes! But it required the "extreme view" to arouse and inspire "the careful, discriminating view" and to attract its audience. What would the "careful discriminating" rake and hoe amount to but for the extreme, rugged, preparatory work of the indiscriminating plow? John Brown's fanaticism and Carrie Nation's hatchet were worth more in *their day* to the causes they served than bushels of "careful, discriminating views" concerning them. A fact frequently ignored in such comparisons is that the "careful, discriminating view" of today was in many instances the "extreme view" of yesterday. The difference is not in the views themselves but in the changed viewpoint of the two periods. There came a time when God found it necessary to send a tempest to break in pieces the rocks, and then an earthquake, and at length a fire, to bring Elijah to his senses, and from his enemies and troubles to his God, so that he could hear "the still, small voice." But Elijah never criticized either tempest, earthquake or fire, because they were "workers together with God" in saving him from himself.—*The Methodist*.

* * *

Philosophy, science, experience, reason, all the best methods of inquiry at our command, must be called upon to guide our feelings and religious enthusiasm.—*Dr. Paul Carus*.

A Symposium on Evolution

By Various Capable Writers



OME time ago the thought occurred to us to arrange for a symposium on the subject of evolution, the special theme proposed being, "What I Regard as the Strongest Reason for Rejecting Evolution, and Why." Accordingly, we wrote to a number of writers who have published books and articles of an anti-evolution character and asked them to contribute to this symposium. The responses have been very gratifying. The essays were not to exceed two hundred and fifty words.

This will account for the brevity with which our writers have expressed themselves.

It is significant that the major part of the objections urged against the evolution theory are scientific rather than religious and theological. This fact proves that our writers are lovers of science, and possess information on the scientific phases of the questions at issue.

This month we publish the articles that follow. Others will appear in subsequent numbers of the CHAMPION.

By J. A. O. Stub, D.D., Minneapolis, Minnesota

(Dr. Stub is the pastor of a large and influential Lutheran Church in the above-named city. He stands foursquare for the evangelical position. Some time ago he presented a paper before the State Board of Education of Minnesota against the teaching of evolution in the public schools of his state. The paper was published in the BIBLE CHAMPION for May, 1927.)

My main reason for rejecting the theory of evolution, as ordinarily presented, is the following:

The doctrine of evolution, although an interesting explanation of origins, is, after all, a philosophical theory which, in its final analysis, annihilates belief in God and creation. If the statement, now current, that 58 to 75 per cent of scientists are atheists is correct, I find in this the explanation for the other statement that 20

to 56 per cent of college students are atheists. The plausibility of the theory tends to lead a young mind, step by step, to the conclusion that religion itself is, after all, only a product of an evolutionary development.

There is no conflict between the revelation of God in nature and in His Word. It is only the false conclusions based upon philosophic speculations that run counter to both religion and exact science.

By Judge Sterling P. King, St. Louis, Missouri

(Mr. King is connected officially with the National Anti-Evolution Society, whose headquarters are 4511 McMillan Avenue, St. Louis, Mo. The Society is scientific, educational and non-denominational. Our writer is the author of a cogently argued book entitled, *Science versus Evolution*.)

Evolution is Scientifically Unsound and Impossible

For more than half a century the concentrated intelligence of the scientific world has been striving assiduously, determinedly and frantically to find or create some supporting evidence for the theory. At first the scientists appealed to the existing organic life to send forth a new series of animate creatures. The microscope was resorted to, and the search extended to the very lowest forms which the most powerful glass could reveal. But not a single new series has ever been discovered in the process of emerging from a higher or lower form.

It is generally admitted that man has not gone through any mental or physical evolution during the past 6,000 years. This same

statement applies to the animal kingdom; for no known species of animate beings is passing from a lower to a higher level. The apes were once supposed to have the ability to pass into human beings, but this tribe is now admittedly disappearing without leaving any human posterity to verify the correctness of the Darwinian hypothesis.

Admitting defeat among the living, the evolutionists then appealed to the fossil remains of extinct animals for supporting data. But here the evidence was equally conclusive against the theory. They claim to have penetrated into the past to the distance of several million years, and yet every specimen discovered belongs to a well-defined species. So far no fos-

sils have been disclosed that indicate that they are the remains of animals which were in the process of being transposed or converted into some other species. The missing link which separates all living organisms into distinct species is found to apply to all past life which has left the fossil evidence of its existence in the remote periods of the world's history. The failure to find evidence of an evolutionary series of life must convince the thinking individual that no such evolutionary change has ever occurred.

The scientists have attempted to create evidence by crossing and interbreeding different species. They have even gone to the extent of trying to create a new series of life in the laboratory. They have followed every suggested course and exhausted every available lead; and yet, as Professor Henry Fairfield Osborn admits, no evolutionary series of life has arisen.

By J. M. Stanfield, Cleveland, Tennessee

(A layman is Mr. Stanfield, and a vigorous writer. He takes both a scientific and religious interest in the subject of evolution. His recent volume, *Modernism: What it Is; What it Does*, reviewed in a previous number of this journal, devotes one section to the hypothesis of evolution.)

I reject the theory of evolution because it is not true to the facts of science; therefore not true to the Bible. It asks me to "believe the unbelievable miracle that mere forces, which are inherent in matter, created accidentally that which could only have been called into existence by an intelligence of the highest order."

The highest exponents of the theory have been compelled to admit that spontaneous generation and transmutation of species have never occurred. But the whole theory is built on these two suppositions, and is therefore false.

While speaking in Toronto, the celebrated William Bateson stated that "acquired characteristics cannot be inherited." Virchow, of Germany, said, "It is all nonsense." Louis Agassiz said: "The theory is a scientific mis-

Evolutionists have labored with indefatigable zeal that classifies their theory as a fanatical religion and takes it out of the category of the sciences. No scientific theory every received so much assiduous labor and prolonged argumentation. And after sixty years of the most strenuous effort no convincing evidence is available.

What the combined efforts of the scientists cannot disclose in sixty years of unremitting labors, we have the right to say cannot be disclosed. What the combined intelligence of the world cannot develop or produce during sixty years of diligent efforts, we have the right to say cannot be developed or produced.

The whole theory is so contrary to observed natural laws, so lacking in supporting data, so illogical and unreasonable, so fantastic and purely imaginary, that it must be rejected by the scientific and logical mind.

take, untrue in its facts, unscientific in its methods and mischievous in its tendency."

Paulsen called Haeckel's reasonings "a disgrace to the philosophy of Germany." Even Darwin admitted that "not one change of a species into another is on record."

Evolution must and does reject the fall of man in Adam, and hence rejects the need of an atoning Saviour in the death and resurrection of Christ, denies all miracle, including the resurrection of Christ; would give us a man-made religion, and substitutes the forces of nature for the God of the Bible.

The theory is fundamentally wrong and opposed to the Bible and historic Christianity, and Christianity as represented by the creeds of Protestant churches today. Therefore I reject it.

By Professor Theodore Graebner, St. Louis, Missouri

(The writer is a professor in Concordia Lutheran Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Mo. Having gone deeply into the scientific phases of the question, he writes with convincing force. Two excellent books are the product of his researches and thinking: *Evolution: An Investigation and a Criticism*, and, *Essays on Evolution*. He entitles the following thesis "The Reign of Mind.")

Evolution seeks to account for the universe without the "hypothesis of a God." It was originated in its modern form, and is today urged, as a substitute for the doctrine of intelligent design. What Christianity attributes to the Omnipotent Mind, that is, to God, evolu-

tion attributes to the working of certain laws of change resident in matter.

If there were a graded scale of beings only in the plant and animal world, one might assume that, with the energies of life, there came into being also certain forces of change

through which the simple became complex and evermore highly organized. However, the fact that mechanical law governs, not only the skeletons and muscles of animals and the cylinders of plant stems, but controls also the comets in their orbits, points to a Source of Power other than an evolutionary law of life. And when the very innermost nature of the substance, so far as chemistry and physics can analyze them, shows the same rule of law, the same reign of Mind, in their graduated scale of complexity, the proof against evolution becomes overwhelming.

It is the tree of life, the classification of plants and animals into species, sub-species, etc., that gives greatest encouragement to the evolutionary view. If they can be so classified, is it not reasonable that the classification is to be looked upon as reflecting a history—that animals and plants have developed from the simplest forms, ever tending to the more complex?

The conclusive answer is the numerical relation which we find, on the one hand, between the atomic weights of the elements, and, on the other hand, in the law that governs the distances of the planets from the sun. Surely there is evidence of a superintending Mind, of

wise design, of an Omnipotent Creator, in this system of elements and of worlds. No one is going to maintain that the crystals of the various elements, so exactly arranged in a numerical scale by the number, inclination, etc., of their sides, constitute a history; or, stated differently, that the more and most complex are derived by evolution from the less complex. Not even the most thorough-going evolutionist has ever claimed that the more complex elements have developed out of those containing a smaller aggregation of atoms, or that the atoms containing highly complex orbits of a great number of electrons have been derived by a process of evolution from the simplest or from the hydrogen atom!

Now, if orderly arrangement, mathematical relations, exact gradation, are no argument for evolution in the field of chemistry, then a similar, however exact gradation carries no such conclusion in the field of biology. Or, stating it conversely, since ordering Mind, creative Intelligence, has undoubtedly established the numerical relations of atoms and of heavenly bodies, the acceptance of the "hypothesis of God" is not only reasonable but inescapable, and the evolutionary theory loses its *raison d'être*.

By Victor I. Masters, D.D., Louisville, Kentucky

(It is a pleasure to receive and print this article. The writer is the efficient editor of the *Western Recorder*, published at Louisville. He has made it a valuable paper—good for true Baptists and for other evangelical Christians as well. He is an editor who stands foursquare. He "believes what he believes in," as the great and good Dr. Henson used to put it.)

I will venture the following: The fundamental inconsistency of the theory with the revealed teachings of the Bible, including the redemptive work of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, for the sins of man, to me constitutes a reason against accepting the theory than which I can think of none stronger. If evolution made out its case, or even came within sight of making out its case, there might be ground for doubting the Bible as the inspired Word of God. This doubt would not be alone in connection with the manifest teachings of Genesis; it would relate itself to the whole system of Bible teaching, its trustworthiness, and the trustworthiness of the Christ.

So far from the evolutionary hypothesis being scientific, able writers, including scientists of standing, have over and over again, within the last ten years, shown that the hypothesis is discredited. It has failed not only to prove particular assumptions on which it

rests; it has failed to prove any one of its larger assumptions. The penetration of the public school system of America by the evolution dogmatists with the teaching of their dogma, intended to reach down and take hold even of the elementary grades, is confirmatory of the bankruptcy of their theory. They have thus tacitly confessed that they cannot expect to win their way before mature minds with so foolish a theory, as against the revealed teachings of the Bible, which have been vindicated by the transformed lives of millions of men and women who have followed its teachings. The penetration of the elementary grades of the public school system of the country by this cult is an unspoken confession, (1) that it is a cult of a debased conception of fairness and justice, and (2) that it cannot hope to win its way before the court of mature minds, but must bend to its ends the minds of defenseless children.

By William E. Biederwolf, A. M., D. D., Winona Lake, Indiana

(Dr. Biederwolf is intensely in earnest. He is known the world over for his successful evangelistic work. He stands solidly for the whole gospel. On the subject in hand he has written an effective brochure with the title, *What About the So-called Christian Evolution?*)

The thing that makes me shudder most in the whole scheme of evolution is an insult to Him who is "the effulgence of the Father's glory, and the express image of His person." Natural, or atheistic, evolution is at least consistent. H. G. Wells tells us that our first ancestor was an eater of decaying meat, eating "his own sick and unhealthy children, as well as dead and half-rotten animals." But so-called Christian evolution, in its pathetic effort at compromise, is willing to allow that God breathed His moral likeness into this low-browed, hair-covered, ape-like, repulsive creature somewhere along down the ages, when it became respectable enough to have this dignity thrust upon it. But tell me, how could such a beastly creature be the type and the pattern

of the Christ, as Paul (Rom. 5:14) distinctly says our first ancestor really was.

It makes one shudder even to think of it, but if Christ came by the way of evolution, as all things in heaven above and on earth below must have come if evolution be true and consistent with itself, then, instead of being the Son of God, the best that evolution can do is to make Him the son of an ape on His mother's side, and, of course, according to consistent evolution, on His father's side as well.

You shall not heap such indignity upon the Son of God!

You shall not put the scion of an anthropoid ape in the manger of Bethlehem!

You shall not stamp upon the brow of God's Son the visage of a "hairy quadruped"!

By Arthur I. Brown, M. D., C. M., Los Angeles, California

(Dr. Brown has to his credit many writings against evolution. His brochure entitled, *Evolution and the Blood Precipitation Test*, is of real technical scientific value, because the author is a skilled physician. He is a Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh. At present he is engaged in lecturing in many parts of the United States.

Organic evolution is an unreasonable, unscientific, unscriptural theory, wholly unsupported by factual evidence in any realm of scientific research.

The fact that it is, in reality, a religion constitutes its most serious menace to the faith of the world, and challenges to mortal combat every true, intelligent and courageous Christian.

It excludes belief in the essential Personality of God; denies the reality of Sin and the Fall of man; ridicules the need of a Redeemer for a lost race; and dishonors and basely humanizes

the Christ, on whom it forces a bestial ancestry.

Masquerading under the cloak of *Science*, its acceptance prostitutes the intellect, elevates finite sinning man to the plane of Deity, degrades and dethrones the Omnipotent God, dissolves Him into a meaningless abstraction, and malignantly slanders the Saviour of the world, while scorning His supreme sacrifice for sin. It discredits and rejects the Bible's claim to be the supernatural record of Jehovah, and relegates it to the scrap-heap of antiquated and fallible human productions.

By Byron C. Nelson, D. D., Perth Amboy, New Jersey

(The evolutionists will have a hard time answering Dr. Nelson's recent book, *After Its Kind*, which was reviewed in the October number of this magazine. A busy Lutheran pastor, he still finds time to investigate scientific themes.)

Having been asked to give what I regard as the strongest reason for rejecting evolution, I will say that, from the side of physical science, I can see no possibility that evolution is true, because of the light shed upon the descent of plants and animals by the discoveries of Gregor Mendel and his successors. The Laws of Mendel, as they are called, are to me the strongest

proof that no evolution of any natural species has ever taken place.

Mendelism teaches that the various forms, i.e., shapes, colors, and other physical characteristics of living organisms are produced by the presence in species of certain things called "factors." These factors descend in the germ plasm from generation to generation, and, as

far as is known, they cannot be destroyed without the destruction of the offspring, neither can they be altered. No mechanical or biological law is known by which new factors can be added to the germ-plasm.

In view of this situation, it is impossible for me to see how any truly new form ever has arisen or ever can arise. All that appears in

any natural species is due to factors which were already contained in its ancestors. William Bateson has clearly expressed it thus: "An organism cannot pass on to any offspring factors which it did not itself receive," and "the factors which the individual receives, and no others, are those which he can transmit to his offspring."

By Professor Alvin S. Zerbe, Ph.D., D.D., Dayton, Ohio

(It is an honor to count so well-known a scholar as Dr. Zerbe among the contributors to this symposium. He is professor of theology in the Central Theological Seminary (Reformed), Dayton, Ohio. He is a technical scholar in the field of Biblical Criticism, always standing for evangelical truth. His two works on evolution are signally effective: *Christianity and False Evolutionism*, and, *Evolution in a Nutshell*.)

Evolution is the hypothesis of an intrinsic, continuous change, according to immutable laws, by means of resident forces, pervading the whole universe and covering every realm of the lifeless and the living and every department of human activity, for, under the new view, force, life, mind, soul, spirit, are at bottom one. Continuity, absolute continuity, says Sir Oliver Lodge, is the backbone of evolution. James Ward, the great English scholar, writes: "Science now regards the universe as a closed system, controlled by natural law and admitting of no interference, even by the Almighty."

In a recent book we read: "Cosmic evolution, and organic evolution, the growth of suns and stars, of earth and plant, and man, are continuous parts of one process, different phases of one continuous, all-pervading process of creation" (Professor Patten, Dartmouth College, in *The Grand Strategy of Evolution*). Patten nowhere uses the words God, Creator, or First Cause, but agrees with Cope that creation is evolution and evolution creation. Has it been proved that suns, stars, plants, animals and man are continuous parts of one process? No, it has not.

The Scripture teaches—and science has not disproved it—that matter, force, life, and human personality are three distinct realms. *First*, there is the realm of matter-force. Matter, even if it is an entity at all, is dead. It is the force resident in matter that is active. But such force or energy never produces life. *Second*, there is the world of life. By some mysterious power, a seed sown in the earth germinates and grows. The real seed is the life-force or principle whose outer enswathement alone is visible. What life is, science does not know. Neither can science produce it. The *third* realm is that of the spirit, of which God is the head. Man is created soul-spirit.

Biblically and scientifically the difference between man and the animal is greater than between the plant and the animal. The reason is obvious. The animal has merely the life-principle, whereas man has, in addition, the spirit or mind principle, which the animal lacks.

Until science proves that mere force produces life and that mere life produces mind, I must decline to accept the current hypothesis of evolution.

By R. A. Meek, D.D., Memphis, Tennessee

(One of the most forceful writers we know is Dr. R. A. Meek, editor of the *Southern Methodist*. He writes not only with force, but with rare grace of style, although he may hardly be conscious of it, so earnest is he in his advocacy of the truth and his defense of the faith. In his paper he has printed many powerful articles on evolution and modernism.)

The strongest reason for rejecting evolution is that it conflicts irreconcilably with the teaching of the Bible, and that of the Jewish and Christian Churches throughout their histories, concerning the creation and state of man. This conflict exists not only in the two *processes* of creation, but also in their *products*. The first man of evolution was a savage but a shade above the brutes, bestial in nature, with but little intelligence, without moral percep-

tion, living in a cave, and eating raw and decaying flesh like a wild animal. The first man of the Scriptures bore the image of God, which St. Paul states embraced "righteousness, true holiness, and knowledge" (Eph. 4:24, Col. 3:10). He was placed in the Garden of Eden under law which he understood, had communion with his Creator, and was benevolent and without inward inclination toward evil. How great the contrast!

According to evolution, there has been no fall of man. This means that there is no evil in the world resulting from the voluntary transgression of a free moral agent, and hence no sin for which man is responsible and for which Christ needed to make atonement. The acceptance of this view would necessitate a re-writing of the theology of Christendom. Out of this necessity has arisen Modernism, which is trying to do that very thing.

If evolution is true, all the marvelous work of Christianity has resulted from the propagation of falsehood. It is asking too much to require one to believe anything so unreasonable, especially when the anthropology of the Scriptures is not contradicted by a single *established fact of science*, but, in many respects, is wonderfully confirmed in the domain of nature.

The Story of the Nativity

By Professor Herbert W. Magoun, Ph.D., Belmont, Massachusetts



HERE is, perhaps, no other story in all literature that has caused so much comment or met with so much incredulity as that of the virgin birth. From the very beginning that story has been ridiculed by the foes of Christianity, it has been regarded by them as absurd, and it has accordingly been rejected as a wild tale of some fanatic. In our day, the incredulity has spread to members of the various churches and likewise to "liberal" preachers, regardless of the denomination to which they belong.

Such persons hold that Jesus was the son of Joseph. They thus reduce Him to an ordinary man, but one of unusual acumen, and they seek to account for His appearance as a leader. They persist, however, in calling themselves Christians, though they must of necessity give up any worship of Jesus as the Christ on such a basis. They are therefore not Christians in the traditional sense.

They accept the teaching of the "New Syriac"; but they overlook the fact that even that version, which attempts to show that Joseph was the father of Jesus, retains Matthew 1:18 and makes it say: "When they had not come together, she was found with child from the Holy Ghost." In plain English that means that Joseph had no chance to be the father of Jesus, and verse 25 in the true text makes it plain that he was not even an accessory after the fact, since he had no carnal intercourse with Mary until after Jesus was born.

Even the New Syriac, then, teaches inadvertently that Joseph could not have been the father of Jesus, and but two alternatives are left. Either the gospel story is true or Jesus was a bastard, precisely as the Jews have always maintained. He is so called by them today. There must be a reason.

But if the gospel story is not true, the question at once arises: "Whence came it?" Men say that it is merely a story similar to those

found in heathen literature where virgin births are common; but they forget one thing. No true virgin birth can be discovered in any other literature, unless we except a case or two that are doubtful to say the least. A Japanese legend says that the mother of Nichirim dreamed of seeing the sun on a lotus blossom and then conceived him, presumably, we may infer, without sexual intercourse, which makes the story a fairy tale and nothing more.

Other heathen virgin births all involve a god or a hero and sexual union except one, which still includes the same basic principle. In the Zend-Avesta a remarkable prediction appears concerning a last Saoshyant, or Savior, who was to be born of the virgin Eredat-fedhri and bring life and light to men; but the conception was to take place with the help of the seed of Zarathustra which had been preserved for about three thousand years by the angel Nêryôsang. He had placed it in Lake Kâsava, and the virgin there received it while bathing.

The nativity story, therefore, is absolutely unique. It excludes all sexual intercourse, denies the presence of any earthly male element, and teaches, in effect, that God Himself, through the agency of the Holy Spirit, created within the virgin's own body the germ cell which causes conception, and so, in the babe that was to be, replaced the human father element by a divine paternity. The child was thus to be human on the mother's side but supernaturally divine on the father's. That idea is not merely unique; it is amazing. Men question it accordingly, since, for nearly twenty centuries, they have found it hard to believe.

Indirect evidence of that fact can be found in the typical oriental insult offered to Jesus on one occasion,—“We be not born of fornication” (as you were), “we have one father” (not two, as you have), “even God” (literally “the God,” *i.e.*, the God that you claim as father). The inuendo is plain enough to an orientalist, and the insult was threefold. They

knew His story and repudiated it unequivocally. He was not the son of Joseph, and they knew that. He bore Joseph's name and thus had two fathers, a real one and a legal one. That explains the insult. (John 8:41.)

It also explains why He is still "Jesus, the bastard," to the Jews. The fact that Joseph married Mary and gave the boy his name made no difference. He was not his son, and they were well aware of it. They were sure that He was an ordinary man like themselves, and the claim that He was the Son of God—that was too rich altogether! He was the son of Mary by some other man, and He had a real father—somewhere. They believed that.

That Joseph gave Him his name is clear from a much misunderstood passage in Luke. The translators were at fault and ought never to have inserted any "the." What Luke said was, "Jesus Son of Joseph." He then added, "the-one *who was a son of Heli*." (Luke 3:23 f.) And he remarked incidentally, "as the custom was"; for *bōs enomizeto* is idiomatic, and it does not and cannot mean "as was supposed." The noun from which the verb comes as a denominative means "custom, law," and no supposition whatever is involved. A little study of Liddell and Scott's lexicon in this connection will make the point clear.

Certain other things will also tend in that direction. Everybody knows that Peter's real name was Simon Bar-jonah or Simon Son of John. What they do not know is that this was the customary way of naming a boy among the Jews. In Palestine, to this day, the custom holds among the few surviving Samaritans. As it was the simplest and most natural way of naming a boy when two names became necessary, the custom has been well-nigh universal. It has many survivals in English; for the suffix-son, the ending-s (as in Williams, Peters, etc.), the prefixes Mac, Mc, O', Fitz- (as in Fitzsimmons), and Ap- (Welsh, as in Price for ApRhys, or Bowen for ApOwen), all mean the same thing as Bar-; and so do German-sohn, Scandinavian-sen, Russian-vitch, etc.

Russian middle names are still so made, and men are called by those middle names instead of by their family ones, except on special occasions. Ivanovitch is an exact equivalent for English Johnson, and Ivan Nichalevitch is merely John Nicholson or Nichols. Moreover, when a Hebrew changes his name from Michaelsky to Michaels, he has not altered its meaning. It is still Son of Michael.

The name given Jesus must therefore have been Jesus Bar-joseph, and that makes it clear that Luke's genealogy is the genealogy of Joseph and that he intended to give the full

name of Jesus as He was enrolled. Jesus Son of Joseph is merely Jesus Bar-joseph translated into Greek, and Peter's name is treated in exactly the same way even if the shorter form is used; for Simon of John (John 21:15) is nothing more than Simon Johns or Jones, and that is only a variation of Simon Johnson. All of them mean Simon Son of John. Unfortunately the Greek patronymics had gone out of use or become poetic; but Homer gives us *Agamemnon Atreidēs* (Son of Atreus) and *Achilleus Pēleidēs* (Son of Peleus) many times over.

Knowing nothing of this custom, the translators missed the point completely and then inserted a "the" before the word "son." It was thus made impossible for them to understand the passage; for they could not see how any man could be the son of another "according to custom." The point made by Luke is that He was named according to custom and so enrolled regardless of His actual paternity as the Son of God, and that fact takes care of Luke's genealogy. It is the genealogy of Joseph as the legal father of Jesus.

Some of the commentators have made another blunder; for they have taken the article meaning "the-one" with the following proper name instead of making it an appositive of the preceding one, and that has led to further misinterpretation and much useless erudition. How they came to misunderstand the Greek idiom is not clear; but it is made evident by their arguments that they did so, and their blunder has been accepted extensively as sound exegesis. Such conclusions are necessarily worthless, and the results obtained concerning Luke's genealogy are no exception to the rule.

What, then, becomes of the long cherished belief that one genealogy is the genealogy of Joseph and the other that of Mary? Merely this. The common belief is reversed; for Matthew's genealogy, not Luke's, is that of Mary, exactly as it should be. "Impossible," you say. Not in the least. It is true that Matthew says Jacob begat Joseph; but he also says that Shealtiel begat Zerubbabel, although Zerubbabel was the son of his younger brother Pedaiah. (1 Chron.3:18 f.) By a figment of the Jewish law, Shealtiel "begat" him through the agency of his younger brother, and the same sort of thing happened in Joseph's case. His real father was Heli. The reading, in the Old Testament, "Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel" is faulty. It should be either Zerubbabel Son of Shealtiel, or else Zerubbabel Ben-shealtiel (once Bar-); for no question of descent is involved. That became his name when he passed into the royal line as the legal heir of Shealtiel, and

nothing more than that is implied.

Women never counted in such matters among the Jews, and for that reason Joseph had to be put forward as the "begotten son" of Jacob, and Mary's proxy,—“the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus.” She was the daughter of Jacob and therefore in the royal line. Joseph was not, but he had to do duty in that capacity as her representative, and a tradition is said to be still extant in Jerusalem to that effect. It is used in explaining why Mary entered the temple to look for Jesus, while Joseph tarried without. He could not enter, not being in the royal line. She could, because she was in that line.

The tradition and popular belief that one genealogy is that of Joseph and the other that of Mary is therefore sound; but its application is wrong, since both Hebrew and Greek usage are opposed to it, and Matthew, not Luke, would naturally be the one to give Mary's line. Joseph had no place in the true line save that of foster, or legal, father to the boy. In that capacity he gave a genealogical line to Jesus in accordance with the Hebrew custom, and Luke so states the matter. Matthew was concerned to show that Jesus was of the line of David; and Mary, not Joseph, was in that line. To reverse that fact, as some have done, is to upset the entire line and throw Jesus out of the reckoning. If Mary was not the one who was in the royal line, Jesus Himself was not in that line, unless He was the son of Joseph, a contingency that is rigidly excluded by the gospel narrative itself.

The fact that women could not count directly is not realized by occidentals, and they therefore fail to understand the part played by Joseph. The oldest son of a king is in the royal line. His younger brothers are not in that line, and they are all out of the reckoning unless and until the death of the heir occurs without issue. In Europe, if a son is lacking, a daughter may become queen; but that was not a possibility among the Jews. If such a daughter married her cousin, as Mary did, he took the place of a begotten son, if her father so elected, and that is what happened. We need to know more about the Hebrew mentality.

The head of the family in an orthodox Jewish house is even now an absolute monarch. His word is law. Here in America, however, it is not possible to continue the practice, and the new freedom marks the passing of orthodoxy with a result that is deplorable. That is why so many apostate Jews flourish as gunmen and bandits. We fail to comprehend the situation and expect other nationalities to conform as a matter of course to our ideals. They

will not and cannot if they are left to themselves, and our liberty becomes license, for them.

The Joseph theory is merely a makeshift, and it is really absurd. It implies that the gospel writers are guilty of false statements and are therefore untrustworthy. It makes little difference whether the statements are intentionally or inadvertently false, since the falseness is the only thing of importance in the premises, if the narrative cannot be trusted. “False in one thing, false in all,” is the legal position, and the courts settle cases accordingly. The gospel writers rule Joseph out and rule him out unequivocally. That should settle the matter so far as he is concerned.

If, then, the story of the nativity is not an accurate account of what happened, some other man must have figured in the case, and the Jews must have the right of it when they insist that Jesus was a bastard. The testimony of Matthew and Luke is clear and explicit, and the apparent omissions in Mark and John are far less important than has been supposed. Mark's gospel begins with the words, “The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, son of God”; or “son of our God,” since the Greek has no article with the word “son” but does have one in some manuscripts with “God.” It is therefore pertinent to ask how Jesus could be the son of God, if he was the son of Joseph or of any other man. Mark never mentions Joseph, and he calls Jesus the son of Mary (6:3). These three facts are significant and have not yet received their due. Without the virgin birth, they become pointless, and an explanation of their origin is in order.

For John the case is even stronger. Commentators have long been puzzled by the words (1:13), “Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man but of God.” The Greek has “bloods” in the plural, and unimpeachable testimony—that of Tertullian, Irenaeus, and Justin Martyr, who together carry the text back about two hundred years earlier than our oldest extant manuscript—makes it clear that the true reading is, *bos ouk . . . egenēthē*, which is singular, not plural, and must therefore refer to Christ Himself, not to His disciples. The change of *bos* to *hoi*, and the addition of *san* at the end are natural alterations, because the mind easily assumes that the relative refers to “them,” in the preceding verse—“to them that believe on his name.” The Greek, however, has “the name of him,” and the relative should refer to “him,” not to “them.”

Biblical critics, notably Blass and even Harnack—he rejected the virgin birth—have felt

constrained to believe that the church fathers were right and that the sentence is singular, not plural; but in that case John bears witness to the virgin birth; for he says: "who was born, not of bloods (sexual union), nor of the will of the flesh (carnal desire), nor of the will of man (Mary's wish), but of God. That produces sense and is easily understood. It needs no learned interpretation of the commentators.

Similarly, Paul makes his position clear at the beginning of Romans; for he states explicitly that Jesus was of the seed of David so far as His flesh was concerned, but that by His resurrection He was "marked out by bounds as the Son of God, so far as his spirit, which was characterized by holiness, was concerned." That is the true content of the Greek sentence; for the Greek genitive in the words rendered "according to the spirit of holiness" means that holiness was the chief characteristic of that spirit. The English fails completely to give the content of Paul's words, as a little study of the balanced Greek original will show. A lack of due attention to the Greek idiom has led to various imperfections in the English translation, and that is why this significant item has been overlooked. "The body was human. The spirit was divine. That is what the words of Paul mean; but without a virgin birth they become impossible, since no other Jesus has ever lived as a result of the indwelling Holy Spirit.

That brings us back to the question: "Where did the story of the nativity originate?" To get rid of it, men have called it an interpolation in the two gospels; but they forget that interpolators would have made the stories more alike, and they would have overdone things by interpolating something in Mark and John. They would certainly have left some of the earmarks of fraud; but no such marks have ever been discovered. The whole is convincingly genuine.

The interpolation theory has been worn fairly threadbare, and it has broken down all along the line. Evidence has now been found that the doctrine of the virgin birth was one of the cardinal tenets of the Palestinian church in the first century A. D., and it is impossible to get it out of either Matthew or Luke without landing in some absurdity or producing an unaccountable lacuna in the text. A consistent and continuous whole requires that the story shall remain as it is now found in the manuscripts.

Observe this point also. While the expression "spirit of God" or "spirit of the Lord (Jehovah)" is common enough in the Old Testament, the phrase "Holy Spirit" or "Holy

Ghost" is confined to the New. Where did that originate? It must be accounted for. Does it have the appearance of being the work of forgers interpolating something in Christian manuscripts?

Observe again that to the ancient Jew Jehovah was a being of such awful majesty that no one ventured to pronounce his name lest he be guilty of blasphemy. Wherever that name occurred another word, meaning Lord, was substituted. The Septuagint follows the same practice, and it was also followed in our own Authorized Version. The revisions retain the original Hebrew word; but to this day the Hebrews themselves avoid pronouncing it, calling it the tetragrammaton (JHVH or YHWH). Who, then, was the Jew that was bold enough to fabricate such a story as that of the nativity? And where did he get the idea? That must be accounted for by those who fancy that interpolation will cover the ground. That theory does not answer the question of origin; it merely dodges and befogs it.

The real question is not even touched. What human brain could invent such a tale, and what fabricator would expect to palm it off as a possibility? The Japanese account of Nichirimi or the Persian tale about the last Saoshyant mark the limit of the human imagination in that direction, and the supposition that men would expect to exalt an ordinary man by inventing a story like that of the nativity is so naive as to be childish. To suppose that the story is not true is to suppose an impossible feat for the human imaginative faculty, which implies a vast credulity in those who accept any such explanation. Moreover, what became of those who objected to such an interpolation? There must have been such, if there was any interpolation, and some record of their objection would certainly have survived among the enemies of Christianity. How is this point to be met by the men who postulate interpolations?

Hallucination on the part of either Jesus or His late followers will not do as a way out, because hallucination does not work in such a natural and apparently sincere fashion. It always has some fantastic feature somewhere; but no earmark of that sort has yet been discovered. Hallucination is a broken reed.

The fact is that the story of the nativity is so woven into the New Testament as a whole that it cannot be taken out and leave a consistent account of the origin of our faith. If, then, that story is not true, its origin must be found. But if it is not true, it must be false, and it must be so either intentionally or as a

result of an unaccountable delusion. Delusion leads back to hallucination; but intentional falsehood leads to the most monumental lie that the human imagination ever fabricated. Who was equal to such a task and what possible motive could he have had?

Did the mild and colorless Joseph invent it to fool himself and others? Did he have any motive for so doing? Did he fool Mary? She says in so many words—if we occidentals only understand her—that she has never had intercourse with a man and cannot have a child in consequence (Luke 1:34). Did the two of them concoct it between them? If so, why did he think of divorcing her? (Matt. 1:19). They were not yet married; but betrothal was about as serious a thing among them as marriage is among us, and that is what is referred to by Matthew.

Did Matthew make up the story and palm it off on Mary, Joseph, and the rest, including Luke, the physician? What chance would he have had to do a thing of that sort? Does Luke read like a man so credulous as to accept such a tale, unless it had every possible indication of being the truth? And what motive can be found for such an action on Matthew's part?

Was Luke the guilty party? Would a man who took such pains to investigate everything and who has always been found so reliable in his facts do a thing like that? Was he such a clever rogue that he could perpetrate a fraud so gigantic? If so, how did he manage it? And what was his idea? He must have had one. Did any or all of these men possess the guile and have the fertile imagination to fabricate a tale so unprecedented and so unlikely? Did they suppose that they could put out such a tale and have it accepted as true? How much of a chance did they have to do that?

Men have always instinctively doubted the story, and they always will. Was the person sane who concocted it, in case it is not true? Is it a human tale in any sense of the word? Is it not, in fact, a story of such transcending and unaccountable diversity in its relation to human ideas that it lies outside of all conceivable human inventions? Who could invent such a tale or expect it to be believed if he did invent it?

When all the ground has been covered and all possible persons have been considered, including all conceivable motives; on the supposition that the story is not true but is a fabrication, it will appear that only one person could have made up such a story, if a human mind could conceive of such a thing, since only one could have had a motive for so doing.

That person was Mary, and the motive was to cover up her shame.

Some sort of plausibility could be attached to such a theory; but if a desperate effort is made to utilize any such method of escape, it will at once become necessary to explain how such a brazen-faced and shameless woman could have been the mother of such a son as Jesus unquestionably was. What becomes of environment and heredity, those doughty champions of the liberals, on such a basis as that? Mary provided much of the environment and much of the heredity; but if she concocted such a stupendous lie and got away with it she must have been the ablest and the smoothest liar that the world has ever known; for she must have fooled Luke so completely that he believed her without question.

Could she, if she was that sort of a woman, have borne a son who would grow up into such a being as Jesus certainly was? Is it not clear that to accept any subterfuge which would do away with the virgin birth requires a credulity far surpassing the faith needed to accept it as true? If it is true, all the other things become natural and accountable. If it is not true, the story itself becomes, in its concoction and acceptance, a miraculous element that cannot be sidestepped and must be accounted for. Here is a dilemma indeed, and those who would make the story false, no matter how they may try to account for it, will find it impossible to escape impalement on one of its horns. Is it less rational to believe the story as it stands than it is to attempt to get rid of it by any of the dubious makeshifts that have been employed by doubting liberals? Verily, when faith goes out at the door, credulity comes in at the window.

* * *

A Boer marksman in the South African war having killed an Irish soldier began to strip him of his clothes. He took off the overcoat and tunic; and then saw something that called a sudden halt. On the breast of the Irish soldier was a crucifix. The marksman stood looking at it, silent, spell-bound; then covered the body and walked away. The gulf that separated between him and his enemy had closed up. And the Cross had done it! The same influence is bringing the nations together today, and bringing them together under the benignant sway of One who is destined to reign as King over the whole Israel of God.

* * *

Some people act as if they imagined prohibition was being tested! Not a bit of it. It is our *democracy* that is tested.

PRAYER MEETING SERVICE

By A. William Lewis, D.D., Bend, Oregon

THE RISEN CHRIST! "Wherefore also God highly exalted Him and gave unto Him the name that is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in Heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." (Phil. 2:9-11.)

The First Morning

John 20:1-18

"Now on the First Day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, while it was yet dark, unto the tomb, and seeth the stone taken away from the tomb." This woman, from whom Jesus had cast seven devils, was the first at the grave on Easter morning. She that was forgiven much loved much. She braved the darkness and its dangers to lay her tribute of love upon the body of her Lord. She saw the angels. Then she first saw the Risen Christ. She was the first to be commissioned to herald the Living Christ. "Go unto my Brethren, and say to them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God."

"And the women who had come with Him out of Galilee came unto the tomb, bringing the spices which they had prepared. Who shall roll away the stone? For it was very large. They saw the stone was rolled away." They entered the tomb and saw an angel in white. "Be not amazed. Ye seek Jesus, the Nazarene, Who has been crucified. He is risen. He is not here. Behold the place where they laid him. But go tell His disciples and Peter, He goeth before you into Galilee." Then they met Jesus, and "Held Him by the feet." "Fear not. Go tell my Brethren that they depart into Galilee; and there shall they see me."

The Roman Guard had an earlier experience than even these women. "And behold there was a great earthquake; for an angel of the Lord descended from Heaven, and came and rolled away the stone, and sat upon it. His appearance was as lightning, and his raiment white as snow; and for fear of him the watchers did quake, and became as dead men." (Matt. 28:2-4.)

"Pilate said unto the chief priests and Pharisees, Ye have a guard. Go make it as secure as ye can. So they went and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, the guard being

with them." "Now while the women were going away, some of the guard came into the city, and told unto the chief priests all the things which were come to pass. And, when they were assembled with the elders, and had taken counsel, they gave much money unto the soldiers, saying, say ye, His disciples came by night, and stole Him away while we slept. And if this come to the Governor's ears we will persuade him, and rid you of care." "So they took the money and did as they were taught; and this saying was spread abroad among the Jews." (Matt. 27:64; Matt. 28:11-15.)

The First Evening

John 20:19-25

The assembled disciples said, "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon." He and John had run to the tomb when Mary brought the good news; and they entered. "John saw and believed," but Peter had not yet grasped the full meaning of the empty tomb. Later Christ convinced Peter.

In the afternoon two of the disciples walked to Emmaus; and on the way Christ appeared to them, and walked with them. They did not recognize Him until He asked a blessing at the table in their home. Then He vanished out of their sight. They returned hastily to Jerusalem. (Luke 24:13-35.)

"When it was evening on that day, the first day of the week, and when the doors were shut where the disciples were, for fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, 'Peace be unto you.' This was Christ's official visit to the disciples as His organized Church. Then again the next "First Day of the Week" Jesus appeared in similar fashion and with similar import, forever consecrating the First Day of the Week as the "Lord's Day." It was so accepted by the early disciples.

"He was manifested unto the eleven themselves as they sat at meat." At first "they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they beheld a spirit. And He said unto them, Why are ye troubled? And wherefore do questionings arise in your heart? See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself. Handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having. He showed them His hands and His feet, and ate before them." (Luke 24:36.)

"The disciples therefore were glad when they saw the Lord." "Jesus said to them again, Peace be unto you. As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you. He breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Spirit."

The Second Lord's Day

John 20:26-31

For the full week Jesus did not show Himself, and the disciples remained inactive, waiting for further instructions. Again on the evening of the First Day of the Week they were all gathered in the Upper Room, now made forever sacred. On the first occasion Thomas was not present, and he would not believe the testimony of the rest. He must see for himself. He had been called Thomas the Twin, but now he became Doubting Thomas. He was present with the others on this second Lord's Day.

God has promised a special blessing to those that gather together in His name, "not forsaking the assembling of themselves together as the manner of some is," and those that absent themselves do not know what they miss. Thomas had a miserable week. He wondered how the others could be so easily deceived. He had lost heart entirely; but he went with the others, with whom he had lived for three years under the leadership of Jesus. This fellowship saved him and his apostleship.

"And after eight days again His disciples were within, and Thomas with them. Jesus cometh, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you." He thought especially of Thomas. He had watched him during the week, and He was determined to bring him into the light. He turned to Thomas and said, "Reach hither thy finger, and see my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and put it into my side; and be not faithless but believing."

"Thomas answered and said, My Lord; and my God." Every doubt had vanished. His former faith in Jesus came back with a tremendous enthusiasm. Christ was accepted as the world's Saviour and his personal Saviour. He was thus prepared for a life of glorious service. Twice after this he is mentioned in the Bible, and on one occasion next to Peter. Tradition says that he preached the Gospel in Persia and was finally buried at Edessa.

"Because thou hast seen me thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." It is unreasonable to demand unnecessary and impossible evidences.

Many glory in their doubts when these are foolish. There are many kinds of evidence that are sufficient to justify us in believing wonderful things, things out of the ordinary. We have proofs many and varied to justify us in believing in Christ's resurrection, and in His messiahship, the living Lord.

The Forty Days

John 21:1-25

"He showed Himself alive after His passion by many proofs, appearing unto them by the space of forty days, and speaking the things concerning the kingdom of God." (Acts 1:2.)

"After these things Jesus manifested Himself to the disciples at the Sea of Tiberias." There seven met again with the risen Christ and received His blessing. "Come and break your fast." There He gave to Peter a special, private lesson on the text, "Lovest thou me?"

"The eleven disciples went into Galilee unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them." They worshipped Him, and yet some doubted. "All authority hath been given unto me in Heaven and on earth."

Paul preached "that Christ died for our sins . . . that He hath been raised on the third day according to Scriptures, and that He appeared to Cephas, then to the Twelve; then He appeared to about five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain until now; then He appeared to James; then to all the apostles; and last of all, as to the child untimely born, He appeared to me also." (I Cor. 15:4-8.)

"And He led them out until they were over against Bethany; and He lifted up His hands and blessed them." "And it came to pass that while He blessed them, He parted from them and was carried up into Heaven." The disciples knew that this was the end of the Forty Days of bodily proofs of the reality of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. "They worshipped Him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy, and were continually in the Temple, blessing God." (Luke 24:50-53.)

"Go ye and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." This spiritual presence was demonstrated on the Day of Pentecost, as the perpetual realization of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, Who "brought life and immortality to light."

By Professor Glenn Gates Cole, Wheaton, Illinois

"Yes," Harold replied, suddenly and with much interest. "To be sure I know them. But I did not know they were there this year. In fact, I never expected Miss Barnes to be back in any college. She did not impress me as being headed in any intellectual direction when I saw her last. And is she really at the university again, and an attentive listener in the church service?"

Of course, he did not expect to make the first team; but his aptness and reliability in teamwork won for him a place in the substitutes' ranks, and he did play for a part of one half in two of the match games before the season ended. He carried on intensive practice in baseball, and the coach assured him he was promising material for that sport. But at any

"A solemn fact, my boy," he replied, lightly. "She looks like a girl who has passed through a great sorrow or other sobering experience, and somehow I felt as much sympathy as admiration for her; why so, I do not know."

"Will wonders never cease?" Harold said, half aside. "That girl has a most surprising power for doing the unexpected, I must confess."

"Say, Goodwin, this interests me," Orton began, wondering at Goodwin's interest. "Did you know her real well?"

"Better than any other young lady in the school."

"Oh, I see! Was it a very serious case? I wager it about prostrated you when she promised to be a sister to you, and so forth, but as for anything nearer—and all the rest."

"You are supposing too much, Orton!" Goodwin retorted. "We were very good friends at one time, but it did not become so serious as you imply, although I will confess that I did prize her friendship very highly at one time."

"I smell romance on the air!" Orton exclaimed lightly. "Here is Goodwin; there is this Barnes girl. They have lost sight of each other; both wondered where the other was. I find the lost heroine. Through me the hero learns of her whereabouts. Now it is up to the hero to make the next move, and write to the heroine. Wedding bells, and I get a ten for performing the ceremony." And Richard Orton went into a convulsion of laughter at the prospect.

But Harold walked away. Orton sobered and looked after him. "Say, Richard, you blundering idiot!" he muttered to himself, "you have done something, I must confess; but what it is, I know not. Could they have quarreled, do you imagine? My curiosity is gigantic, but I shall not say another word to him about it. I would not hurt his feelings for the world—I value his friendship too highly. And, worst of all, I am afraid to try an apology for fear I might blunder again." And then to register his disgust of himself, he gave a vicious kick at his shadow, as he noticed it in a convenient position on the ground before him.

Harold had not considered the effect on Orton of his hasty departure. He only knew that he wanted to get by himself to think. Bettie was back there! His duty was to write her an apology or something. Perhaps he ought to explain fully what he had suspected. But no, that was not a proper matter to entrust to a letter. Oh, yes! It would be better to go and explain matters at once.

But no! he had no evidence that she even knew or cared for the mistake he had made. But was it a mistake? Of course it was! Bettie was not the girl to be carousing around the streets at late hours alone with men of Allen's type. By the time he had reached his room his course was arranged. He sat down at the table and wrote:

"Dear Miss Marshall:

"I just learned of your whereabouts through Mr. Orton. Old scenes and experiences sweep me like a tide. Friendships are too few in this life that we can throw cherished ones aside. Our baseball team has a game with West Hill commencement week, and I am encouraged by our coach that I shall likely make the team. If so, and I get to West Hill at the time of the game, I have a matter which I want to confess to you, and gain your forgiveness. I shall look forward to that privilege in hope. "Respectfully yours,

"HAROLD GOODWIN."

But Bettie never received this letter. She was at class when the postman left it at Ivy Hall, and Helen pounced upon it, recognizing the handwriting immediately. She surreptitiously tore it open and read it. Then she put a cigarette in her mouth, touched a match to the folded letter, and used it to light the cigarette. As she puffed she watched the flames eat up the letter as far as her hand, deftly shifted her hold to the charred end, and held it in a position for the flame to finish the work of destruction. The charred paper was then deposited in the wash bowl, the water turned on and all the ashes swept out of sight into the exit pipe.

"A mean thing to do," she said to herself aloud. "I love Bettie dearly, but treat her abominably. I would not do such a thing except in the case of dear old Harold. I can not give him up to Bettie, even if I am—" But as she did not finish except perhaps in thought, what she meant can not concern us at this stage.

One day, when spring was well along, Doctor Coleman came across Harold as he was leaving a class, and asked him to walk with him for he wanted to discuss an important matter.

"Goodwin," he began, "I am needing a substitute. I am a member of an important state scientific committee, and just had a telegram from the chairman that the committee would meet here tonight for a conference. Positively I cannot be out of town when they come. But I have promised to deliver the commencement address to the high school at Wilton tonight, and can not disappoint them. Now, I believe you can save me. Will you fill my place at Wilton?"

"Why—why—no, Doctor, I fear I shall

have to refuse," Harold stammered. "You can send one of the professors. How about President Williams?"

"I suppose I can find some one else," he agreed, "but, Goodwin, I want you to go. It will be a splendid experience for you in many ways. I will give you my roadster, and you can drive over towards evening, deliver the address, drive back in the night, and not miss any of your classes. It is not more than twenty miles from here, or thirty at most."

"But I have no speech prepared," Harold began by way of excuse. "I fear it would be a very poor substitute that I would be."

"Not at all," the doctor argued. "You still have your speech well in mind that you gave two weeks ago to the Teachers' Conference over at Partonville. As I told you at the time, it was one of the best I ever heard. I had planned to use what I could remember of it myself. Just work that off on the Wilton audience, add anything to it that suggests itself, and I guarantee that your reputation is made. It is just the chance you need."

"I'll do it, doctor, if you have confidence that it will be all right," Harold agreed, enthusiastically.

"I am sure it will, and it will be a great accommodation to me. Come over as soon as you are ready. I will hurry home and tune up the roadster for you."

And so, just at dark the big roadster parked before the high school at Wilton, and Goodwin joined the crowd passing into the auditorium. He had been delayed on account of a failure to make a proper turn and had gone on half an hour out of his way. But he was still in time, although the class and teachers were already together, discussing the proper order of entrance to the platform. On inquiry the superintendent was pointed out, and Harold reported to him.

"Doctor Coleman," he began, intending to add "could not come, being detained, etc.," but the busy superintendent, having never met Doctor Coleman, thought he was merely introducing himself, motioned him into a place in the line, at the same time giving him a hearty handshake by way of welcome, and immediately moved elsewhere to untangle a congestion which required immediate attention.

And so it happened, much to Harold's amusement, that before he could explain matters he was marched onto the stage and introduced as the famous Doctor Coleman of Nazareth College, a man whom possibly none of them had ever been fortunate enough to know, but whose reputation was a household word in nearly every home in the community.

"Well, Harold, old boy," he soliloquized, "here is a big contract for you. It will never do for these good people to be disappointed, and you must not detract from the fame of your good friend, nor lower the prestige of Nazareth. Do your best for him, and it."

And he did. The importance of the occasion sobered him, and he rose without an apparent tremor to the occasion. He might have explained the mistake, but that would have availed nothing now, and would have placed an unintended burden on the mistaken superintendent. So he decided to overlook the mistake and do his best. He drew a long breath to overcome the first fear of stage fright, and then like a flash an amusing story came uninvited to him. To steady himself he told this, and found that its aptness won the attention of his hearers as nothing else could have done. And then his mind was at his command. His well-committed speech came without a break. It was couched in simple words that all could understand, but dealt with matters which were of great import. It placed fairly before them the dangers confronting our school system, and the need for Americans to arouse themselves to the base influences which thus honeycombed the great structure.

"There are two philosophies of education," he continued. "All educational processes are adjusted to one or the other of these. One idea is that man is continually tending toward perfection through natural law; the other that man naturally tends toward deterioration, and needs training, discipline and guidance. Unfortunately our present attitude is the first, our authorities claim that we must leave the child to his own devices, permit him to select all his studies as it pleases him, must avoid disciplining him, and above all, not to teach him anything which requires effort on his part. In fact, the idea is to make education a game, and pleasure the aim and pursuit of life. As a result our young people lack intensity to apply themselves, have no respect for law, and their great besetting sin is selfishness. Self-expression of emancipated youth is the motto. It tends to anarchy.

"Nature is not tending toward perfection. Leave your fields uncultivated and learn the tendency of natural law. Let your livestock shift for itself, and watch the sad degeneracy that will in a lifetime produce scrubs and culls where now you pride yourselves on the fine blood and inbred qualities of the stock. Evolution is but an empty term. Christ was the Great Teacher, and he never taught the system so popular with the faddists of our day or His. He crystallized His system of pedagogy about

such statements as 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.' 'Strive to enter in at the straight gate.' 'I must work the works of Him that sent me.' And when He came in the Spirit to the Revelator to commit, as it were, the post-graduate doctrine of His educational policy, He said, 'As Many as I love, I rebuke and chasten: be zealous therefore.' We need some old-fashioned discipline in our educational system, a training to have respect for law, fewer electives and a goodly number of subjects that compel the child to put his mind upon the intensive and mastery of a subject."

And thus he continued. At times his well-arranged figures almost brought the more emotional to their feet, and when he finished the applause threatened to raise the roof.

"Doctor Coleman," he mused, as he became aware of the reception his address had received, "you are a famous man in this town from now on." And the joke was so good he could hardly contain himself, but managed to suppress his feelings with a smile. He wondered how a young fellow like himself could thus delude these people into accepting him without question in place of a man at least twelve or fifteen years his senior. But evidently they had.

After the exercises were over he was besieged by those who wanted to shake hands and offer compliments. The faculty and graduating class were highly pleased, and pressed him so warmly to attend their alumnal banquet which followed that he could not resist.

And so it was very late when he pushed the starter on the roadster, for even after the banquet several graduates importuned him for information concerning Nazareth as a college for them to attend, and he had a number of questions to answer. He had inquired the right road and was sure that even at a moderate speed he could reach Nazareth long before day.

The first long, straight stretch of his journey ended at a main bricked thoroughfare which ran in one direction sixty miles, on through Warburton into West Hill, where he knew Bettie was. Here was the turn he had missed in coming. He had not turned off, and in consequence had gone on for ten miles before he discovered his mistake and retraced his route. He recognized this road on reaching it, and turned to the right toward the city. He was to follow the brick and then a half-mile higher turn off to the left onto another road running straight through to Nazareth.

As he hastened onto the brick road he became conscious of an automobile ahead, and immediately saw that it was drawn up by the roadside. He was peering intently to the left side of the road so as not to pass his turn, but

at the same time he watched the other car through curiosity.

"Apparently other night-hawks out as well as myself," he said aloud by way of breaking the monotony of the ride. "I wonder if I had better stop?" he thought, as he drew closer. He could not see the occupants, but just as he passed a lady in the back seat arose and called out to her companions who were somewhere along the roadside, beyond the light shed by the car.

The voice pierced him like a knife. It was the sweet voice of Bettie Marshall. What was she doing here? He did not understand what she said, but here was something it was his duty to investigate. He dashed by, slowed up as he discerned his turn close by, rounded it, drew down by the roadside, stopped the engine, switched off the lights and ran back on foot toward the other car.

He had just come alongside the seat where Bettie was standing when a pistol shot rang out. By the light of the flash he saw Helen on the bank beyond the road, with the pistol at her temple, crumpling to the ground between two men who appeared to be trying to support her from falling. But, horror-stricken in the light of the shot, they let her slip from their grasp. At the same instant a scream of anguish came from the car by his side, and Bettie fell out over the car door and would have crashed onto the brick but for him. The unexpected weight bore him down to the road, but, happily, he broke her fall. Instinctively he lifted her in his arms and hurried to his car.

"Now to save a woman's reputation," he thought. "A big job ahead for the next two hours."

He gently placed the unconscious Bettie in the roadster, and then paused, irresolute. Should he go back and lend assistance to Helen? But it was too late. He heard the whir of the starter, and hurrying back to the brick road, he could discern but one man in the driver's seat, while another seemed bending over someone in the tonneau. He surmised that the latter was supporting Helen. They were moving away, and soon were tearing down the brick at a terrific speed. "Hurrying her to a doctor, or some place for help," he concluded.

And then his own task recurred to him. He hurried into the car, drew Bettie to his shoulder, with his right arm supporting her. He feared that some sudden lurch might throw her out, or that she might return to consciousness and jump from the car. With his left hand he pushed the starting rod, and with the same hand placed the lever at middle gear. It was on a slight grade, and by letting in the

clutch very gently the car gradually started without stalling the engine. Steering with one hand he got back into the road, and moved at a moderate speed through the darkness, for he did not think best to switch on the lights at this time. Then, by a dextrous movement and good judgment in doing so, he hurriedly took his hand from the wheel, with his left hand pulled the gear-shift into high, recovered the wheel, and let in the clutch. The engine jerked, and he feared it would stall, but by releasing the clutch slightly it gained headway, and moved quietly onward. Of course, driving without lights was a difficult task, but the starlight revealed the outline of the road sufficiently well for the speed he was going, while his memory of that part of the road which he had traversed that evening enabled him to keep the car to its course.

And now his concern was for Bettie. She might recover any instant, and her changed surroundings must not be such as to shock her more than necessary. So he began in a low tone to talk to her, pulling her down as far as possible into a reclining position that her heart might have an easier task of pumping the blood to her head. Over and over he repeated:

"Do not be alarmed, Bettie, you are safe with Harold Goodwin. We are on the way to Ivy Hall."

Shortly he felt her body straighten convulsively, and then she grew quiet as though trying to comprehend the import of what he was saying. Next a full return to consciousness, a shudder, and she spoke:

"Harold Goodwin? Where did you come from? How did I get here?" But, like an awakening child, glad to find an arm of safety about her, she did not try to withdraw from him. Finally she started, and gave a low scream. "Oh, I remember now!" and convulsive-swept, she moaned, "Oh, Helen! Helen! Harold, this is terrible!"

For a moment he feared she might become irresponsible, or at least hysterical, or even faint again. But with his eyes on the dim road ahead, and his one hand firmly guiding the car onward, he trusted entirely to his words to quiet her.

"Pull yourself together, you brave little girl! Be of good courage and trust all to me. Do not think of what is past, but remember that your reputation is at stake, and that we are going to save your good name. Before daylight you must be back in Ivy Hall. Think only of that. I am running without lights for a little distance so that no observer shall be able to connect our car with the one we left. Now, as soon as you are your own brave

self again, sit over in your corner, and I can give my attention to the car, but remain where you are until you feel yourself strong and not afraid."

For a few moments she snuggled close like a frightened child, and unconsciously clutched his hand until he winced with pain from the convulsive working of her fingers. Then she slowly straightened up, drew herself reluctantly from his side, and settled back into her corner of the seat.

"Now go!" she said. Immediately he switched on the lights, accelerated the feed, and the great car, as though realizing the important duty ahead, plunged rapidly and steadily into the night.

A mile ahead was another brick road which was the main line of travel from the Nazareth section to the city. It was already in sight, and nearing rapidly. Carefully the car slowed down for the turn, and then the speed again increased as the roadster pointed down the brick. Bettie had tensely watched the turn, and at the same time Harold's masterly control of the great car. Now she sank back, calm and reassured.

"How well you drive. I am not going to fear the speed in the least. I know I can trust you."

"Yes, I am confident of my skill. I have quite an experience in driving. But if you can, I think the best thing for you to do is to talk. Tell me the whole story. I ought to know, and confiding it to me will be a relief to you."

Trustfully Bettie drew near. Her left arm rested on his shoulder, and her face was turned so that he could easily hear her words above the roar of the engine. And thus, as the miles raced by, she poured out her heartbreaking story, from the time that Helen had come back from the West to the tragic hour when she had pitched out into Harold's arms in a dead faint.

"About as I expected," commented Harold. "Do you know that at the time I found you there was never a suspicion in my mind, but an absolute belief in your innocence of any wrongdoing, and a half-suspicion that in some way your goodness and loyalty had unthoughtedly brought you into an unhappy situation. And now I want to ask you for another explanation—not that I longer have any suspicion but that you are innocent, though I once did. Were you ever driving about the city at a very late hour, with Allen, on an occasion when his car was struck by a trolley car?"

"With Allen? Why, no! I never went driving with Allen alone in all my life. Who

said I did?"

"No one said so; I saw you," he replied.

"I must deny that," she said insistently. "You may have seen some one who looked like me, but you never saw me for the reason that I never went out with him alone at all, and only a few times with Helen and him, early last year. When was this occurrence you speak of?"

"The night before I left West Hill last year," he said.

"And that was the reason you—oh, I have no right to ask. I mean how did you recognize me?"

"By your dress. The lady I saw either wore your dress or had one exactly like the one I saw you wearing that very day."

"Did you see her face?" Bettie asked.

"Since you mention it, I don't remember that I did."

"Harold Goodwin, I am surprised at you, sir! I am more than surprised; I am very much hurt at your lack of confidence in me! You say it was the night before you left?"

"More correctly, the morning I left," he explained. A great burden had lifted from his heart.

"I have very good reason to remember that night and that day," she explained, thoughtfully. "The fact is, I was not out of my room that night, but retired with a very sore heart because of Helen's actions. I recall now that I imagined Helen had disturbed my clothes during the night, as I found them in an unusual disarray the next morning. I wonder if—Oh, Harold, what a night this has been! Was there ever another such in the history of the world?"

She sank back into her corner again, and gave way to hysterical sobbing. Harold decided this would not do, and so thought of another question to divert her. He asked:

"Why did you not answer the note I sent you about two months ago, asking for an interview that I might explain this to you before?"

"A note? I never received a note from you two months ago, nor any other time this year. I never knew what had become of you until you rose up so unexpectedly out of the ground tonight, just in time to break my fall. And I did not recognize you then."

"I wonder if—" he began and stopped.

"So do I wonder if—" but she did not finish and sank back again. The houses began to grow numerous; they were in the edge of the city. For safety Harold slowed down, and as the car jolted over a railroad crossing, a sound as of a pistol shot rang out. Bettie jumped

and shrieked, but fell back abashed, as she saw the houses so numerous. The car jolted on.

"What was it?" she finally asked.

"Blowout! But we must keep moving," he replied. "Tire is gone for good, but there is a garage right ahead, and I will get another car. If daylight holds off a half-hour more you will be in your room at Ivy Hall."

As he finished speaking he turned in at the garage. But just as they crossed the sidewalk and were entering the door the engine gave an exhausted cough and stopped.

"Out of gas!" cried the night man, who was standing at one side watching the entrance of these early tourists, "but it is now on a level, and you and I can push it out of the way if the lady can manage the steering-wheel."

Harold sprang out, and Bettie slipped into the driver's place. In a few moments the car was in. Harold turned to the man.

"Have you a car I can have in a hurry? Will be back in an hour, and you can fill the tank and put on a new tire while I am gone. Is it time for the 'Limited' going west?"

"You can make the Limited all right; half an hour yet," the man replied, looking at Harold keenly. "Here is a car of the same model as yours, but a smaller one. Hop in and let her out. Traffic cop is off duty this time in the morning."

Almost in the time it takes to tell, the transfer was made and they were speeding onward into the city. Bettie turned to him and asked:

"What did you mean by inquiring about the Limited?"

"Just this," he explained, "I know that the Limited leaves just as daybreak comes this time of year. Not knowing the exact hour it leaves, it occurred to me that by asking that question I could gauge the time we have remaining."

"And can we make it?" she asked, that contingency being the paramount consideration at this time.

"Close shave!" he replied. "Ivy Hall is further away than the station; but we have got to be in time."

And just as the "Limited" whistled for the first crossing as it left the city, their car glided to a stop in the side street behind Ivy Hall. It had hardly stopped until Bettie was racing across the narrow grass plot toward the padlocked door she had passed through a few hours before—a few hours, but an eternity of events had taken place in that short time.

"Now, Bettie," Harold had cautioned just before reaching the Hall, "I think it best for

you to say nothing about this night to anyone unless you find it necessary. As least say nothing until you know what has become of Helen. Be brave, and remember that all our efforts this night may prove valueless if you speak a single unthought word. Your reputation is at stake, do not forget. If you reach your room without being seen, signal by your light, two flashes."

With fast-beating heart he watched her window, and with even faster beating heart Bettie drew aside the padlock hasp and glided into the darkness of the basement. The strangeness and gloom was appalling, but in-

tuitively she made the proper turns, and emerged into the dimly lighted corridors, flew noiselessly up the stairs, and after what seemed an age to the watcher outside her light flashed up, then out, then on again. It had hardly appeared until the clutch was gently engaged, and when Bettie hurried to the window she found the street deserted. So far as anyone in Ivy Hall knew, she had not been out of the building that night. Overcome with the strain, and realizing that in all probabilities the danger of her wild escapade was over, she sank languidly into a chair.

THE LIBRARY TABLE

Conducted by Professor Leander S. Keyser, D.D., Springfield, Ohio

A List of Anti-Evolution Books



WARM friend of the BIBLE CHAMPION has made a valuable suggestion. He thinks that this would be a good time to publish a list of books that oppose evolution, and has asked us whether we could not furnish such a roster. We are glad to do this. It is really surprising to note how many cogent anti-evolution books have been issued. Yet the evolutionists go on and on dogmatizing on the theory, apparently unaware of the existence of these books. Very few of the advocates of evolution even make a gesture to indicate that they know anything about this general uprising against their favorite theory. The headiness and *aplomb* of the evolutionists is really an amazing phenomenon. It amounts to a real spectacle in the history of science.

But when we come to make up our list, we at once get into trouble. So many good works against evolution have been published within the last few years that we cannot mention all of them, and so we must make a selection. And that is a difficult task. We fear that some that are omitted may be just as forceful and convincing as those we mention. Since we must select from the many, lest our list should become so long as to be confusing and defeat our purpose, we will simply say those which we name are all books that are worthy of study, and that present cogent reasons for rejecting the prevalent theory. Many of the reasons are scientific; others are ethical, philosophical and religious. Here is the list as far

as we feel warranted in extending it at the present time:

THE CASE AGAINST EVOLUTION (1925; second printing, 1926). By George Barry O'Toole, Ph.D., S.T.D. The Macmillan Company, 60 Fifth Ave., New York. \$1.75.

This is perhaps the most technically scientific work against evolution that has thus far been published.

THE DOGMA OF EVOLUTION (1925). By Louis Trenchard More. The Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J. \$3.50.

Professor More (Professor of Physics, University of Cincinnati) does not take positive ground against evolution, but presents an array of facts and arguments against it that prove its improbability.

ORGANIC EVOLUTION CONSIDERED (1911); **"THEISTIC EVOLUTION"** (1919). By Alfred Fairhurst, A.M., D.Sci. The Standard Publishing Company, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Professor Fairhurst (now deceased) was a thorough-going scientist, and made out a strong case against evolution from the purely scientific viewpoint.

THE BANKRUPTCY OF EVOLUTION (1924). By Harold C. Morton, M.A., Ph.D. Marshall Brothers, Ltd., 24-25 Paternoster Row, E. C. 4, London, England. 2s. 6d. About 95 cents.

This English work is one of the best. Dr. Morton knows both science and philosophy.

THE NEW GEOLOGY: A TEXTBOOK FOR COLLEGES (1923); **"EVOLUTIONARY GEOLOGY AND THE NEW CATASTROPHISM"** (1926). By George McCready Price, M.A. Pacific Press

Publishing Association, Mountain View, Calif. \$3.50 and \$1.85 respectively.

These two books deal with the geological phases of the problem, and show that the fossiliferous strata of the earth do not occur in the order required by evolution. Some vast cataclysm alone can account for these conditions.

THE PHANTOM OF ORGANIC EVOLUTION (1924). By George McCready Price, M.A. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, Chicago and London. \$1.50.

In this book Professor Price exposes the weaknesses of evolution from various standpoints.

EVOLUTION AT THE BAR (1922). By Philip Mauro. Hamilton Brothers, 120 Tremont Street, Boston, Mass. 60 cents.

This book is precisely what its title indicates: it calls evolution before the bar of science and reason.

THE LOGIC OF EVOLUTION (1925). By Charles B. McMullen, Ph.D. Richard Badger, Boston. \$2.50.

We consider this book one of the most impressive presentations of the evidences against evolution that has come from the press.

THE PROBLEM OF ORIGINS (1926). By Leander S. Keyser, M.A., D.D. The Macmillan Company, 60 Fifth Ave., New York. \$2.00.

Besides pointing out many of the joints in the armor of the evolutionary advocates, the author shows the reasonableness of the Biblical doctrine of special creations.

THE COLLAPSE OF EVOLUTION. By Luther T. Townsend, D.D. Frank J. Boyer, Publisher, Reading, Pa. 20 cents each; \$17 per hundred.

The author of this brochure gave trip-hammer blows to the theory of evolution. It is a book which everybody should read, whether he believes in evolution or not.

EVOLUTION: AN INVESTIGATION AND A CRITICISM (third edition, 1926); "ESSAYS ON EVOLUTION (1925). By Theodore Graebner. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 80 cents and 75 cents respectively.

The author has been a student of physical science for many years, and knows whereof he affirms. It is idle to accuse such a scholar of lack of information.

GOD'S ANSWER TO EVOLUTION (1924). By Thomas Cary Johnson. Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va. \$1.00.

This book should be read far and wide. The thought moves on a high plane, showing that the only adequate explanation of the universe is the spiritual interpretation in connection with the physical.

CAN THE CHRISTIAN NOW BELIEVE IN EVOLUTION? (1926). By William Hallock Johnson, Ph.D., D.D. The Sunday School Times Company, 323-327 North 13th Street, Philadelphia, Pa. \$1.50.

A most competent critique of evolution from both the scientific and religious viewpoints. Dr. Johnson has a most judicial mind.

MODERNISM: WHAT IT IS; WHAT IT DOES; ITS RELATION TO EVOLUTION (1927). By J. M. Stanfield. The Christian Alliance Publishing Company, 260 West 44th Street, New York. \$1.50.

The second part of this book not only shows that evolution is not scientifically demonstrated, but also exposes its sinister effects on religion.

THE RED THEOLOGY IN THE FAR EAST (1926). By Charles H. Coates. Charles J. Thynne & Jarvis, Ltd., Whitefriars Street, E.C. 4, London, England. 6s.

A most impressive book. A large part of it deals with scientific phases of the problem of evolution. Other parts display the baleful effects of both evolution and modernism in China.

CHRISTIANITY AND FALSE EVOLUTIONISM (1925). By Alvin S. Zerbe, Ph.D., D.D. Central Publishing House, Cleveland, Ohio. \$2.00.

Dr. Zerbe is thoroughly qualified to write on the subject. He has studied physical science deeply, and also other sciences of still greater importance in forming a world-view.

EVOLUTION IN A NUTSHELL (1926). By Alvin S. Zerbe, Ph.D., D.D. Laird & Lee, Inc., Chicago, Ill. \$1.00.

This concise book tells us just what evolution is, and how inadequate it is to explain the varied phenomena of the cosmos.

EVOLUTION IN THE BALANCES (1926). By Frank E. Allen. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, Chicago, London. \$1.50.

A very competent work, written in a terse and interesting style, with unanswerable arguments.

THE TRUTH ABOUT EVOLUTION (1925). By William Schoeler. The Lutheran Book Concern, 55-58 East Main Street, Columbus, Ohio. 75 cents.

A little book big with testimony to the truth, written in a terse and readable style; packed with reason and fact from beginning to end.

THE MODERN TRIANGLE: EVOLUTION, PHILOSOPHY AND CRITICISM (1926). By S. James Bole, A.M. The Biola Book Room, 536-538 South Hope Street, Los Angeles, Calif. \$1.50; 16 cents postage.

Written by an author who is both a Christian and a scientist—a good combination. It saves him from advocating a one-sided view.

SCIENCE VERSUS EVOLUTION (1925). By Sterling Price King, LL.B. Modern Science Press, 4511 McMillan Ave., St. Louis, Mo. \$1.

An incisively written book, showing conclusively that evolution is not entitled to the name of science. The author proves that one part of organic nature could not long exist without the other; therefore the doctrine of long ages of development would have been impossible.

AFTER ITS KIND (1927). By Byron C. Nelson, Th.M. Augsburg Publishing House, 425-

429 South Fourth Street, Minneapolis, Minn.
\$1.50.

A thoroughly scientific and sane examination of the problem. The gist of the book is that species breed true to type; it must be so or organisms could not subsist. The author was once inclined to accept evolution, but further investigation released him from its toils.

REASON AND EVOLUTION (1927). By George A. Zellers. The John C. Winston Company, Philadelphia, Pa. \$1.50.

An author who summons the theory of evolution before the bar of reason and fact. Read the book and see how the theory fares.

One-Man Bible Translations

By A. Z. Conrad, Ph.D., D.D., Boston, Massachusetts.



MOFFATT'S translation of the Bible represents the prodigious toil of a truly great scholar. It is an attempt at Bible readability and up-to-date-ness. It puts the Bible into conventional English of the hour, with the laudable objective of giving people a Bible that will seem less removed from the man in the street and more likely therefore to be read. How far has the objective been attained? If from any one scholar we might expect accuracy as well as popularity, we should expect it from Dr. Moffatt. But is it possible for any one man to give us a translation that is not colored by his own theological viewpoint? Much might be said, and truly said, of the excellencies of "Moffatt's translation." We would not disparage the many interesting and profitable features of this great piece of work. We would, however, seriously call in question the wisdom of using this translation as a substitute for the King James or the Revised Version. Moffatt's translation is *not* the transference of the content of the words of the original into English. That is exactly what a genuine translation is. A large group of eminent scholars worked together on both the King James and the Revised Versions. The personal factor had little chance for expression, since these scholars were checks on one another. There is no such check when one man is working alone. However able or well-intentioned, inevitably his work will reflect his preferences and prejudices and reveal his limitations. All this appears again and again in Dr. Moffatt's work. It is not so much a *translation* as an *interpretation*. It will be found exceedingly interesting as *collateral reading* of the Bible. Its departures and its interpretations through the use of conventional English should be carefully checked up to avoid wrong conclusions. Do not permit it to take the place of the accepted translations, with

Besides these books, quite a number of helpful booklets have been issued, written by such thoughtful and well-posted authors as the following: A. C. Dixon, C. K. Lehman, F. P. Lebuffe, G. W. Stuart, Arthur I. Brown ("Evolution and the Blood Test"), A. Funck, W. M. Frysinger, W. H. Griffith Thomas (deceased), James M. Gray, William E. Biederwolf and W. Bell Dawson. All the above-named works, including the booklets, have been reviewed in previous numbers of the BIBLE CHAMPION.

their reverence, dignity and accuracy. Dependence should not be placed on any one-man translation of the Bible.

Out of a large number of instances that might be presented to indicate what we mean, let us take just one illustration from "Moffatt's translation." In *The British Weekly* of July 21st, 1927, the following appears:

Dr. Moffatt in his New Testament translation writes (St. Luke 23:44,45): "Darkness covered the whole land till three o'clock, owing to an eclipse of the sun." Now we all know that it is only at new moon that there can be an eclipse of the sun, and the time of the Crucifixion was the time of the Paschal full moon. Has there been any eclipse recorded when the darkness lasted three hours? It was thought rather remarkable that during an eclipse of the sun in Sumatra the darkness lasted six and a half minutes.

In the original manuscripts there are two readings of this passage. (1) That followed by our Authorized Version: "There was darkness over all the earth until the ninth hour. And the sun was darkened." (2) That rightly followed by the revisers as better attested: "A darkness came over the whole land until the ninth hour, the sun's light failing," literally "the sun failing" (margin) or rather "having failed." The word here rendered "fail" is *ekleipein*; and the point is that while it was employed like its English derivative "eclipse" as an astronomical term, it is never, apart from this passage, so used either in the Greek New Testament or in the Greek version of the Hebrew Scriptures. And it is not a little remarkable that in the Greek Testament, but for an Old Testament quotation in the Epistle to the Hebrews (I:12), the word is peculiar to St. Luke. He has it in two other instances where it signifies simply "fail." (1) 16:9: "Make to yourselves friends of" (rather "by means of") "the mammon of unrighteousness, that when ye fail," that is, "die" (cf. Psalm 73:26), "they may receive you"; where the true reading is "that when it (the unrighteous mammon) shall fail." (2) 22:32: "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not." It was natural that St. Luke should have had a fondness for the word, since it was a medical term, used for example of a fever "failing" or "abating," and again of the heart "failing." It is one of the numerous professional terms which distinguish the vocabulary of "the beloved physician" in his Gospel and the Book of Acts.

It would indeed be strange had he departed from his usage in the passage before us; and there is positive proof

that he here employs the word in its familiar and ordinary sense. As early as the second century the idea had arisen that it is here an astronomical term; and not only was it expressly reprobated, as by Julius Africanus in his *Chronicon*, but, that there might be no mistake, the text was modified by the substitution of "the sun was darkened" for "the sun failing." Origen viewed it otherwise, regarding the former as authentic and supposing it to have been changed by unbelievers into "the sun failing" in order to discredit the Evangelist by imputing to him a palpable absurdity—a solar eclipse at full moon. On either view it appears that the idea of an eclipse was not in the mind of the Evangelist; and to introduce it in translation is not merely a linguistic error but the attribution to the Evangelist, after the example of Keim and other rationalistic critics of a blunder which he never committed.

What was it then that occasioned the darkening of the sun and the failure of its light? There was no eclipse, but there was an earthquake (cf. St. Matt. 27:51-54)—no very frequent visitation indeed in the Holy Land but by no means unknown, always severe, and by reason of its very rarity the more terrifying (cf. Amos 1:1; Zech. 14:5). The last had occurred in the year 31 B. C., devastating Judæa and, according to the historian Josephus, burying no fewer than ten thousand persons beneath the ruins of their houses; and the horror of it was still fresh after the lapse of sixty years. The present disturbance had been portended by the unseasonable cold of the previous night (cf. St. John 18:18); and when it came, it was attended by the usual

phenomena, precisely as these are described by a traveller who experienced an earthquake at Beirut on January 1, 1837. It was, he says, "a quiet Sabbath evening. A pale, smoky haze obscured the sun, and threw an air of sadness over the closing day, and a lifeless and oppressive calm had settled over the face of nature." And even so the Evangelist describes a like scene when he writes: "it was now about the sixth hour, and a darkness came over the whole land until the ninth hour, the sun's light failing." It is a narrative of sober, historical fact, and no fiction of impossible portents such as were fabled as attending the death of Julius Cæsar.

College Park, Belfast.

David Smith.

In the face of this evident inaccuracy, is it not perfectly clear that "Moffatt's translation" is only to be trusted when it accords with the perfectly apparent meaning as given in our accepted versions?

We would by no means deprecate the value of Moffatt's and other translations as collateral reading. Let us be thankful for those versions that represent the co-operative wisdom of a large group of eminent scholars. This is true of the King James Version, the Revised Version and the American Revised Version. These versions do not differ in any matter of doctrinal importance.

Reviews of Recent Books

Life Beyond the Grave. By Rev. J. J. Knap (Groningen, Holland). Translated by Rev. K. Bergsma. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. \$1.50.

Translated into simple, terse, idiomatic English, this is a most engaging book. It is not a literal translation of the Dutch, but every sentence gives the thought of the author correctly. This makes the book all the more readable—because it is a real translation, and not a literal one. The author is a minister of the Established Church of Holland, and is "a leader among the orthodox group of that church," says the translator. "He is a defender of the faith once delivered to the saints." The author everywhere upholds the Biblical doctrine of the future life. He gives a strong argument for the immortality of the soul, and does not base it merely on rationalistic ground, as does Dr. Fosdick in a recent book, but shows that Christ and the Bible taught the doctrine clearly. He demonstrates from the testimony of the Holy Scriptures the self-conscious "state of the soul between death and the resurrection." There is no sleeping of the soul during that interim. Neither is that intermediate state a condition of purgatory. Immediately at death the believing soul, separated from the body, is purified by divine grace before entering into heaven. This is the true doctrine. What the

Old Testament teaches regarding the future life is set forth in a luminous way. The author pointedly declares that in the heavenly life there is "no development from sin to holiness," but there will doubtless be development of spiritual insight and degrees of glory in the immortal life. While heaven will be a state of rest, it will not be a state of inactivity. We have found the book most uplifting.

God's Care of Mankind. By Eva M. Stiltz. The Lutheran Publication House, 1228-34 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, Pa. Two Volumes: For the Teacher, 75 cents; For the Pupil, 50 cents.

These two beautiful volumes are the fifth in the series of Religious Education Texts for Weekday Schools issued by this Lutheran firm. The one for the teacher contains the suggestions for the teacher and also those for the pupil, while the other and smaller volume contains only the instructions for the pupil in preparing for the lesson. The contents of the books are admirably arranged to teach the great lesson of God's care for mankind. The first part deals with special sections and incidents of the Old Testament; the second contains vital lessons which Jesus taught in the gospels. Certainly pupils who follow these lessons under wise teachers will feel that the God of the Bible

is a loving God, who cares for His people and is not willing that any of them should go astray. And that is a most important lesson for children to learn at an early age. It will save them much trouble in their subsequent lives. We think that other religious teachers besides Lutherans might well adopt those textbooks, for here they can be sure that the children will receive the right kind of teaching.

Jesus and His Friends. By Mabel B. Fenner. The Lutheran Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa. Two volumes: *For the Teacher*, 85 cents; *For the Pupil*, 60 cents.

Too much cannot be said in praise of these beautiful and helpful books. The material is arranged in the same way as is indicated above in the volumes by Eva M. Stiltz, except that here the lessons are intended for the primary pupils of the second grade, age about seven. The interest of the parents is to be enlisted in the preparation of the lessons, so that they may know something about their study before they go to the school. A definite program is suggested for each lesson, and yet the teacher is left free to adapt the teaching to the specific needs of the pupils. The books may be used for both the Weekday Religious Schools and the Daily Vacation Bible Schools. In the book for the pupil there is a winsome little message to the boys and girls and a suggestive note to the parents. Why not use these books and give the children true evangelical instruction? The missionary stories interjected here and there will prove interesting and inspiring to the children.

The Sermon: Its Homiletical Construction. By Professor R. C. H. Lenski, D.D. The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio. \$2.00. net.

Many books on sermon construction and delivery have been published, but there is room for still another when it has as many marks of thoroughness and originality as this one displays. It is a truly good book. Dr. Lenski is, first of all, loyal to our Lord and the Word of God. That is one reason why he is a good homiletician; for any studious man who goes to the inexhaustible treasury of God's Word will be fertile in thought and method. It is only those who depend on their own limited wisdom who "run out of material." This work would certainly be a good one for a text in a theological seminary. It is no less valuable to the minister already out in the active pastorate. The first part deals with the text, and gives good reasons for choosing a Biblical passage as a text. This method helps to keep the preacher Biblical, gives him variety, and saves him from mental exhaustion and despair. He can al-

ways go to God's inspired truth for suggestions. Nor does this method relieve him of the need of study and wide reading. Then in logical order our author deals with the divisions of the sermon, the theme, and the elaboration, all of which are treated in various subsections arranged in logical array. Many illustrations of how homiletical work should be done are given by the author in specific cases. His treatment of various Biblical texts has the merit of much variety and not a little originality. A decidedly fresh chapter is the one on "Elaboration According to Psychological Norms." The last chapter, which deals with "The Introduction and the Ending" of the sermon, is especially rich in suggestion. No sermon will be spiritually ineffective and rhetorically tame, if it is constructed and delivered according to the principles set forth in this convenient and timely volume.

The Layman and Religious Literature. By George Scheid. The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio. 45 cents.

"Blessed is he that readeth" (Rev. 1:3), is the motto of this thoughtful little book. In many ways it shows the need of good reading matter. Often a good book will save a person from making a serious mistake that may have a sinister effect on his whole life. The author tells how he was led astray for a while by the insidious arguments of the evolutionists, and was only saved from the toils of this theory by wider reading and investigation. Reason is piled upon reason why the layman (and the minister as well) should be diligent in reading good literature. The book has a strong Lutheran coloring; yet it will be helpful to all Christian people.

The Mosaic Law in the Light of Modern Science. By Thomas H. Nelson. The John C. Winston Company, Philadelphia, Pa. \$1.50.

After you have read this book, you will have a much clearer knowledge of the scientific character of the laws of Moses. Our author shows that the Mosaic legislation anticipates the modern laws of sanitation, healthfulness in the preparation and use of food, proper rest for man and beast, the prevention of sexual diseases, and many other matters that have been discovered only in recent years by the labored researches of scientists. He shows that sin, especially anger and jealousy, affect the glandular system, and thus tend to destroy physical health. Many of the ceremonial laws which Moses established have far more than a mere symbolical use; they also make for health, cleanliness and cheerfulness, and were employed to fumigate the air of the desert and the tents of the Israelites. Moral harmony also induces

good health, because it is in accord with the normal functioning of the physical organs. This is really an eye-opening book. It contains a good deal of repetition, but that is probably intended by the author for emphasis.

The Captivity of Jacob. By Carl Heinrich Caspari. Translated from the German by John W. Richards. The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio. \$1.25.

This is an interesting story of the trying times in Hungary during the middle of the sixteenth century. At first the movement may seem to be a little slow, but soon the adventures begin, and you are carried on to the end with keen interest. Jews, Christians, Turks and unbelievers figure in the story. The bitter persecutions of the Jews are vividly depicted, but it is shown that true Christians, those actuated by the spirit of Christ, did not persecute the Jews. It was people who were unregenerate who resorted to violent measures. The bitter feeling of the Jews against Christ is also portrayed. The invasion of Hungary by the Turks under Soliman furnishes a tragical setting for the characters of the story. Jacob is the chief hero; hence his name occurs in the title of the book.

Helps for Bible Study. By Rev. William Stuart. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 208 Pearl Street, Grand Rapids, Mich. \$1.50.

This valuable manual contains an introduction to the books of the Bible and an outline of their contents. The author is the teacher of the Bible in the Grand Rapids Christian High School. The book is intended to be an aid to the study of the Bible and not to be a substitute for it. For that reason no supplementary readers are named, as that might lead away from such direct Biblical reading and study. We find it an excellent handbook of instruction. While it is primarily intended as a textbook in high schools, teachers' training classes, Sunday schools and pastors' Bible classes, it is also a handy reference book in any library. The author is loyal to the Bible as the inspired Word of God. He does not spring critical questions, but his whole attitude toward the Bible is that of the evangelical believer. He gives the right interpretation of Genesis 1:1 when he says: "To create is to make something out of nothing, or to call into existence by an act of omnipotent will. This is called immediate creation. When existing material is used, the word 'make' is employed." The questions of the origin of the world and man, of sin and of redemption are treated in their logical order and in the devout evangelical spirit. Mr. Stuart is a teacher in whose hands

you can trust your young people, knowing that their faith will not be undermined, but established on a solid basis.

The Tabernacle: Its God-Appointed Structure and Service. By Iris Ikeler McCord. The Bible Institute Colportage Association, 843-845 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill. 40c.

What a wonderful divine unity we find in the Holy Scriptures! Surely this suggestive little book proves that the New Testament is latent in the Old. There is a divine purpose in every part of the Bible, if men will only study it in the receptive state of mind. Our author examines minutely the tabernacle as erected by Moses according to divine direction, and shows how each part typifies some salient truth in the plan of redeeming love and grace as it has been fully revealed in the New Testament. To be able to establish this fact makes a strong argument for the organic unity of the Holy Scriptures, although they were written by many different authors at widely different times and in widely separated countries. Such unity can be adequately explained only on the ground that the Biblical writers were moved and guided by the Holy Spirit, who would everywhere make His teaching harmonious.

More Than Atonement: A Study in Genetic Theology. By John B. Champion, M.A. The Evangelical Press, Harrisburg, Pa. \$2.50.

We frankly confess that we have found it difficult to grasp the central and regulating idea of this book, and hence we hardly know how to evaluate it. It is a large work (459 pages) and it seems to us that the author has taken a roundabout way of getting at the gist of his discussion. The title of the book, "More Than Atonement," creates a feeling of uncertainty in the mind to begin with. And nowhere, as far as we can find, is there a clear and concise statement as to just what the "more" is. So one might get the impression that the author means to belittle the atonement. That, however, we feel sure, was not in his mind, for again and again does he make the cross of Christ central. It seems to us that the author's purpose is to discuss the Divine Plan of Redemption through Christ in all its bearings, in which the fact of atonement is basic, but of course is not the only doctrine.

The author touches more or less on all the cardinal principles of the Christian system, all of them revolving around and correlating with Christ's redemption. The divine personality, the creation of the universe and of man, the Trinity, the deity of Christ, the incarnation, the sacrifice of the cross, the work of the Holy Spirit, the terrible nature of sin—all are neces-

sary corollaries in working out the Biblical plan of redemption. In it all redemption is the central thing. As the author says, the redemptive work of Christ is "the fontal doctrine of Christianity." That is evidently what he means by "Genetic Theology" in his sub-title—namely, that the self-sacrificing nature and love of God are the genesis and source of all God's work in His creation, and especially in the restoration of man to divine favor and fellowship. He calls his view the "fulfillment interpretation," by which he means that the redemption of man through divine vicarious sacrifice fulfills the divine nature, and is part of His being from eternity. Hence the atonement had its Godward as well as its manward aspect. This is most certainly true. If expiation was not necessary to fulfill something in God, it was a superfluous work.

Professor Champion gently criticises some of the defective theories of the atonement, especially the so-called "moral influence" theory. He includes in his view the doctrine of substitution and penal suffering, but thinks there is something more, although he does not make clear to our mind what the *plus* is that is needed. We think that the attribute of divine justice does not receive adequate treatment in this volume, for surely the redemptive work of Christ, including atonement for sin, must have had some relation to the principle of eternal justice. Atonement means that very thing, that "God might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." To uphold and vindicate the moral economy of the universe surely must be a part of the fulfillment interpretation of the doctrine of redemption.

However, the book, difficult as it is in some respects, is a cogent discussion. It is virtually a survey of the whole field of systematic theology. And it is Christocentric and, we might add, redemptio-centric. The Bible is everywhere accepted as the norm of authority. The author is the Professor of Christian Doctrine in the Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa., and is the author of two other good books, *The Living Atonement* and *The Virgin's Son*.

Present Tense Salvation. By John W. Ham. The Bible Institute Colportage Association, 843-845 North Wells Street, Chicago. \$1.35.

"Sermons that struck home" is an apt way to characterize these discourses. Mr. Ham is a well-known author, evangelist and minister, who has also had experience as a pastor. A graceful introduction is furnished by John D. Freeman, D.D., Editor of the *Baptist Reflector*, Nashville, Tenn. The best test of sermons is,

Do they bring results? That is just what these sermons have done as they were delivered; they won many souls to Christ. Many a hardened sinner has been melted to repentance and brought to faith in the all-powerful Christ through the instrumentality of these sermons. The author is thoroughly evangelical. He not only believes the Bible to be God's true and inspired Word, but uses it as if it were; hence the Holy Spirit, who inspired it, always honors and blesses its hearty presentation. Mr. Ham knows Christ personally as his Saviour; no less personally does he know the Holy Spirit as his regenerator and sanctifier. His style is terse. He uses no long sentences. Hence you need not strain your mental powers to follow him, but can give all your attention to his arresting and impressive messages. His discourses on "The New Birth," "Walking With God," "Coming Out and Going In," and "Spiritual Millionaires," are models of effective homilies. They grip you like steel. The author uses many illustrations, some of which are garnered from his own rich and varied experience. He has produced a book that will be helpful to both ministers and laymen.

Christianity and Common Sense: A Dialogue of Faith. By Clarence Edward Macartney, D.D. The John C. Winston Company, Philadelphia, Chicago and Toronto. 303 pages. \$2.00 net.

Dr. Macartney is one of the outstanding defenders of the faith in our day. He is conspicuous for the courage of his convictions, the cogency of his reasoning, the clearness of his presentation, the power of his speech in public address, and the kindliness of his spirit in the midst of controversy. All of us remember his courageous maintenance of the evangelical position at Union Theological Seminary some time ago, coupled with the utmost courtesy toward those who differed from him. The present book is one of the strongest works on Christian Apologetics that has ever been issued. Of course, we use the term "Apologetics" in the scientific sense—in the sense of a well-reasoned and orderly vindication of the chief doctrines and principles of the Christian system of truth. The author's object is to bring these fundamental doctrines before the bar of the best kind of reason, that of common sense, to see whether they will stand the test. He is too wise and discriminating to maintain that everything can be absolutely proven by argumentation; but he rightly holds that all the Christian doctrines can be shown to be reasonable when examined in the light of common sense, and that the opposite views can be shown to be at least inadequate; therefore the

objector ought to lay aside his criticisms and seek an experience through Christ, who alone can give the final assurance of truth. While the author appeals to common sense, it must not be thought that he does not plow deep. He evades no difficulties, however profound. How many of the objections of skeptics disappear when examined in the simple light of common sense! Dr. Macartney has put his arguments in the form of a dialogue between a Celestial and a Mortal. It is rather a unique conception, and adds to the spiciness of the polemic, which is conducted throughout with the utmost cordiality. The great doctrines of the Christian system are thus canvassed in a most interesting way. The argument is so effective that we hope skeptics and infidels, as well as believers, will read the volume, and weigh it with unbiased minds. The book has come at the right moment.

Atonement and Law. By John M. Armour, D.D.
The Bible Institute Colportage Association,
Chicago, Ill. 65 cents.

If you want to read a solid book on one of the most profound and at the same time most fundamental doctrines of the Christian system, get this well-made paper-bound volume. Dr. James M. Gray, President of the Moody Bible Institute, has written an introduction to it, and has given it his endorsement. It is a reprint of a book that was written a good many years ago; but we do not know of a more recent book which is more profound and Biblical. One of the cardinal purposes of the learned author was to show that redemption through the atoning work of Christ is entirely in harmony with law as revealed in nature. Therefore our Lord's redemptive work was not something alien in the universe. While it has its unique features, which cannot be duplicated anywhere else, yet there are many suggestions and illustrations of the vicarious principle in the realm of nature and in the experiences of the human family. In the most vital way redemption is not "the great exception," but lies in the very structure of the natural and moral universe. A careful reading of this volume will correct many errors that have been current regarding the atonement, and will show the reader that the doctrine of substitution is entirely reasonable.

Song from Sightless Land. By Howard W. Pope.
The Bible Institute Colportage Association,
843-845 North Wells Street, Chicago.

Before Mr. Pope became blind, he was engaged in many useful Christian activities. For more than eight years he was superintendent of men in the Moody Bible Institute. For twenty years he was associated with D. L.

Moody in the work at Northfield and Chicago. Other activities brought him in contact with many people, and showed him the value of the Christian faith in many circumstances. But when he was stricken with blindness, a new test of his faith came. God upheld him in this sore trial, and put into his soul many beautiful and inspiring thoughts, which he has put into poetic form. These poems are indeed comforting. It is uplifting to see how God buoys up the soul even when physical sight is gone, and all the world is dark. But if the light within Mr. Pope's soul had also been darkness, how great would have been that darkness! But the author's experience proves that when the inner light shines brightly, no affliction can quench the joy and gratitude of the soul that has been redeemed and illumined by the Holy Spirit through faith in Jesus Christ. What a witness to the verity of the Christian faith! Would unbelief ever cheer the heart in such condition? These poems have decided literary merit. Sometimes a break in the thought occurs in order to make the rhyme, but as a rule the verse flows along in a clear and beautiful stream of thought.

Lesson Commentary for Sunday Schools, 1928.

Edited by Charles P. Wiles, D.D., William L. Hutton, D.D., and D. Burt Smith, D.D. The United Lutheran Publication House, 1228-34 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, Pa. \$1.75.

This firm is quite forehanded this year. It has gotten out this valuable lesson commentary in good time for review in 1927, so that those who desire it can get it at the beginning of the new year. Thus they need not miss a single Sunday School lesson for the year 1928. It is a deserved word of praise to say the book this year is as good as any of its predecessors have been. It may be said to be even better, because the editors have profited by previous experience and by suggestions that have come to them along the way. It is of interest to know that the lessons for next year will consist, first, of the gospel of the Son of God according to St. Mark's record; second, of the life and letters of St. Paul. Certainly this will be an attractive series of studies for both teachers and pupils. To show how helpful this commentary will be, we give the order of treatment for each lesson: The text according to the American Revised Version; the lesson goal; the lesson plan; oriental sidelights; geographical and historical setting; the text interpreted; truths for daily living. Here you have an admirable synthesis of Biblical exposition and application. We know of no better Sunday School help than this for teachers and advanced pupils. People of all Christian denominations

can use it with profit, for they may be assured that its authors are both evangelical and scholarly.

Twelve Sermons on the Word of God. By Charles H. Spurgeon. Philadelphia School of the Bible, 1721-25 Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 60 cents.

No stronger commendation can be given to this collection of Spurgeon's sermons than our wish that every teacher of theology, every student in our seminaries, every preacher in the active work of the pastorate, and many thousands of laymen could read them. They are models of homiletical content and construction. Spurgeon had learned the fine art of marshalling his material in logical order. He always used divisions. Yet his sermons never seem to be stilted and artificial. There is a spontaneity about them that makes one almost forget the form in one's interest in the thought and the uplift it brings to the mind. He also was able to find many unique texts, some of them very striking; and yet he always used them in their contextual setting. Some of the suggestive titles in the collection are the following: "A Talking Book," "Infallibility: Where to Find It and How to Use It," "How to Read the Bible," "The Swiftly Running Word," "Not Bound Yet," "The Bible Tried and Proven," "The Sword of the Spirit."

The Pedagogy of Jesus in the Twilight of Today. By Walter Albion Squires. George H. Doran Company, New York. \$2.00.

Perhaps the subject of religious education holds the key place in the serious thought of the day. There is so much sinister teaching at the present time. Hence it is needful for men who feel a real concern for the well-being of our generation and the generations to follow, to speak out bravely and clearly, exposing the wrong and proposing the right. Professor Squires' book is of the right kind for this purpose. It is a distinctively strong and timely contribution. It points unmistakably in only one direction, and that the right one. There is no dubiety about the author's meaning and position. Monism and behaviourism in psychology and mechanism in philosophy received deserved and effective criticism.

In multiplied ways the author shows that Jesus was the model and master Teacher. It is wonderful how in all cases He used the best and most effectual methods of pedagogy. He knew just how to adapt the truth to his pupils, whether He was speaking to the learned Nicodemus, or the humble woman at Jacob's well, or to a mixed multitude of auditors. He was simple, yet profound. He never failed to

hold attention. If instructors today would adopt His spirit and methods, and would at the same time impart more of the contents of His teaching, they would achieve far better results in building up true character among the youth of the rising generation. Mr. Squires' analysis of Jesus' pedagogy is so salient and complete for a good reason—because he accepts the whole gospel record of His life and work, and does not pare it down to a rationalistic and diminished segment.

A Handbook of Christian Theology. By John Alden Singmaster, D.D., LL.D. The United Lutheran Publication House, 1228-34 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, Pa. \$2.25.

A good, usable, evangelical textbook on Christian theology, one that is strictly evangelical and is yet brought up to date, is a real desideratum today; and, behold, we have it right here before us. Dr. Singmaster entered into rest on February 27, 1926, much beloved and honored and greatly lamented. Fortunately, however, for the Christian world, the manuscript for this volume was prepared by him and practically accepted for publication before his sudden departure. It is, therefore, as the publishers say in a touching tone, "a monument to his memory and a medium for continuing his theological teaching."

The work has many merits and few, if any, demerits. First and most important, it is four-square in its evangelical character, the doctrines always having their basis in the Bible whose inspiration, authenticity, and authority the author accepted *ex animo*. From the Biblical basis the development of doctrine proceeds along logical lines. While the author was acquainted with liberal theology, he did not find it necessary to yield to it in order to preserve his spiritual and intellectual integrity.

There are a few places where one might differ from the author's interpretations and other statements, as when he makes some unnecessary concessions to the theory of evolution (pp. 101, 102). His use of the term, however, is not the strictly scientific one, but the elastic sense which is used by many good men who do not discriminate as clearly as they should.

The methodology of the book is to be commended. By classifying the material in a clear and systematic way, and using an orderly method of notation, with various heads and sub-heads and different fonts of type, the teacher and student always know just where they are in the system, while lesson assignments can be easily made. The general reader will also appreciate such a scientific assembling of doctrinal material. Some technical terms are used. We think a few more might have

been inserted to acquaint the student more fully with the technique of this important discipline. A place ought to be made in a dogmatic system for such terms as Cosmology, Hamartiology, Soteriology, Ecclesiology and Sacramentology. Of course, these topics are excellently treated in the book, but we think the scientific terms should be used and defined.

The introductory matter is excellent. We entirely approve of giving a section to Apologetics, thus placing Dogmatics on a solid basis. This is especially appropriate in these days of doubt and inquiry, when many people want to know the whys and wherefores of their faith.

An outstanding merit of this work on scientific theology is the simplicity, lucidity and terseness of the style. Here are no long, involved and obscure sentences. And this does not imply that the author is superficial—far from it. Except in his inadequate treatment of evolution, the author everywhere reveals a mastery of his subject.

Selected Articles on Evolution. Compiled by Edith M. Phelps. The H. W. Wilson Company, New York.

The compiler of this volume means to present both sides of the controversy on evolution, and to do it fairly. Judging from her preface, however, we incline to think that she leans a little to the theory of evolution and to a somewhat modernistic view of the Bible. The books she cites on page 12 are of the liberalistic sort. Such views of the Bible are easy to reconcile with the theory of evolution, because the Bible is not accepted at its face value by its critics, and hence can be made to teach any doctrine that suits them. Yet our compiler has selected many articles on both sides of the present debate, and hence we commend it at least in part, because the reader can here compare the arguments pro and con, and decide for himself on their relative merits. For our part, we believe that the anti-evolutionists have the best of the argument, because they stick closer to the facts of nature as we know them and indulge less in guesses of what happened so long ago that nobody can check the *ex cathedra* statements. Had we had the opportunity, we could have cited much cogent literature against evolution not mentioned in the compiler's bibliography. Even the article by the present writer which is reprinted in this volume from a rather obscure magazine is

not by far his strongest printed presentation of the case against evolution.

Reason and Evolution. By George A. Zellers. The John C. Winston Company, Philadelphia, Pa. \$1.50.

The many strong scientific books against evolution that are coming from the press certainly ought to lead the advocates of that theory to re-examine their ground, to see whether they have correctly interpreted nature's data. Much as has already been written on the subject, here is really a worthwhile new book. Mr. Zellers' primary purpose is not to defend the Bible, but to canvass the scientific basis of evolution, and to bring it to the bar of reason. He gives it a thoroughgoing test, and finds it sadly wanting in scientific verification. The case against evolution is strongly put, but there is no abuse. He defines both science and evolution in the right way, and distinguishes between them—an achievement that far too many people today seem to be unable to accomplish. Most clearly does he show (Chapter IV) that some processes in nature, which are sometimes called evolution, are not evolution at all. A strong chapter is the one entitled "Evidence Against Evolution." He deals effectively with the problem of evolution in the public schools. He supplements his main thesis with two addenda, which are of great value. He thought his subject through before he went to the publisher and the printer.

God's Purpose Toward Us. By Ira M. Boswell. The Standard Publishing Company, Cincinnati, Ohio. 65 cents.

What a comfort to know from Holy Scripture that God's decrees cannot be frustrated! He will accomplish whatever He determined to do in eternity. This is the firm position taken by our author in this excellent little book. Many Biblical passages are cited and collated to prove the immutability of the divine purpose. God's "repenting" does not mean that He changes His mind any more than it means that He feels sorrow or conviction of sin; it denotes His grief at the sins of the people whom He has created and the change of His treatment of them when they turn from sin to God. Our author also holds that the eternal purpose of God included, took into account and made provision for, the free acts of moral agents. It is a suggestive and helpful book, and we are glad to commend it.

Our Library Exchange Department

Advertising in this department is exclusively for Bible Champion Subscribers. Only articles used in a Library—Books, Typewriters, etc.—may be offered. Cash must accompany order at following rates: 10c a line for first insertion, and 8c a line for every insertion after first. Count 7 words to a line. Minimum charge 30c per insertion. Remit to Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

Note—Where only initials are given in address make money order payable to Bible Champion or order and payment will be forwarded to proper party.

FREE—We have a lot of various issues BIBLE CHAMPION between years 1913 and 1918 you may have for the asking—if you'll pay postage on them at rate of 2 cents each number.

FREE—Still have quite a few of Dr. Bates' tracts on *The Church*. It also contains a three-fold study of the three-fold content of the term World. Really it is worth while. Only postage required. Send 2c for a sample, or 5c for a dozen. BIBLE CHAMPION, Reading, Pa.

WANTED—The Pulpit Commentary—Matthew, Psalms, Minor Prophets—If you have these or other Pulpit Commentary Volumes, write Rev. V. A. Crawford, Brevard, N. C. State condition, price.

FOUND—In clearing storage we found a small lot of Sermon Books—GREAT SERMONS BY GREAT PREACHERS. We returned many orders, thinking we were sold out. If you want a copy order early. Price \$1.25. We also discovered a small lot of ALTAR AND RING—a Beautiful Wedding-Day Souvenir. We also returned many orders for these. If you want a bargain order at once. Price 50 cents each. Address Frank J. Boyer, Reading, Pa.

DAMAGED BOOKS—We have a few more Damaged Books left. Will send any named below, prepaid, at small price named. Christianity and Positivism, by *McCosh*, cost \$1.25, for 60c; From Pulpit to Poorhouse, cost 75c, for 25c; Christ and His Religion, cost \$1.50, for 40c; Concessions of Liberalists to Orthodoxy, cost \$1.50, for 40c. We also have a quantity of paper cover, Life of Moody, all new and perfect, will sell at 7c each, regular price 12½c. Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

FOR SALE—Address on Second Coming of Christ, paper, 224 pp, 25c; Prayers offered at 62d Congress, by *Dr. Couden*, paper, 137 pp, 50c. All good condition. All prepaid. Address B.C.C., Bible Champion.

LIKE NEW BOOKS—Pronouncing Bible, sheep binding, with Books of Psalms in meter, \$1.25; N. T. Annotated Paragraph Bible, 8 vo., \$1.00; The Old Way, *Rhoads*, 50c. Complete set Homiletical Commentary on the Old Testament, 21 volumes, good as new condition. Cost \$60.00—will sell for \$20 cash. All like new, all prepaid. Address S.L.D., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS CHEAP—Chosen of God, *Lathe*, (\$1.25) for 65c; Municipal Reform Movement, *Tolman*, (\$1.00) for 40c; Methods & Principles, *Winship*, (\$1.00) for 50c; The Growth of the Kingdom, *Gulick*, (\$1.50) for 65c. Greater Life Work of Christ, *Patterson*, cost \$1.50—75c; Getting One's Bearings, *McKenzie*, cost \$1.25 net—for 75c; Unselfishness of God, *Smith*, cost \$1.25, net—for 65c; Life of Abraham Lincoln, in 2 vols., cost \$2.00, for \$1.00; American Bookmen, cost, \$2.00, for \$1.25; Parallel Gospels and Reference Passages, cost \$1.50, for \$1.00; Life of Christ, illustrated, cost \$2.50, for \$1.50; one vol.—Revelation—of Biblical Illustrator, cost \$2.50, for \$1.00; Foster's Essays on Decision of Character (cost \$1.50), for 50c. All prepaid. Address A.B.A., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

FOR SALE—Postpaid. Good condition. New Testament with Notes, 50c; Fleetwood's Life of Christ, cost, \$3.00, \$1.25; Young People's Bible History, cost \$2.50, 75c; Won by Prayer, or Life and Work of Rev. Oshikawa, 50c; Pulpit and Grave, *Wheeler*, paper, 20c; Christian Love, *Edwards*, 40c. Address M.H.H., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

SECOND-HAND BOOKS CHEAP—Prices in parenthesis are what books cost new. *Hamilton's* Mexican Hand Book, Ills., (\$1.50) for 35c; *Dewey's* Works (\$2.50), for 75c. All fully worth price asked. All sent prepaid. Address, O. P. R., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

FOR SALE—Books like New. Figures in parenthesis show what they cost. Will mail any book prepaid for 50c. Romance of Providence, (\$1.50); Christianity and Science (\$1.00); How to Gesture, (\$1.00); Modern Cities (\$1.00); Fifty Years (\$1.00); Henry Boynton Smith (\$1.00). Address A.B.B., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS—Universal Encyclopedia, 6 vols., cloth, cost \$15—for \$7.50; American Bookman, *Howe*, cost \$2.50—for \$1.25; Life of Abraham Lincoln, 8vo. cloth, 2 vols., like new, \$1.25; Growth of the Kingdom, *Gulick*, cost \$1.50, for 60c. All new from an unused library and tops show a bit of shelf exposure. Sent prepaid. Address S. S. T., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

FOR SALE—NEW. Christianity's Greatest Peril, *Ekkholm*, (\$1.50) for 75c; Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels, *Thorburn*, (\$2.00) for \$1.00; Christ, His Nature and Work, (\$1.75) for \$1.00; Up in Maine, 6th Ed., *Day*, (\$1.00) for 40c; Chat About Celebrities, *Guild*, (\$1.50) for 85c; Way of the Preacher, *Kern*, (\$1.25) for 65c; Growth of the Kingdom, *Gulick*, (\$1.50), for 65c; Artists and Arabs, cost 75c—for 40c; A Study in Pedagogy, (75c) for 40c; S. S. Normal Class, for 25c; Life's Everydayness, for 30c; Good Tidings, (35c) for 20c; Sanctified Spice, *Peters*, (75c) for 40c; Pleasures of Literature and Solace of Books, *Shaylor*, (75c) for 40c; The Listener in the Church, (35c) for 20c; *Wasson's* Religious, Social and Political Essays, (\$1.50) for 65c; Great Books as Life Teachers, *Hillis*, (\$1.50) for 75c. All prepaid. Address R.S.T., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

FOR SALE—Cost price in parenthesis—Outline of Theology, *Hodge*, (\$1) 50c; Manual of Gesture, *Bacon*, (\$1.00) 50c; 100 Great and Memorable Events in U. S. History, leather, (\$7.00) \$1.50; *Edward's* History of Redemption (75c), 30c; Pre-millennial Essays, cloth, 528 pp (\$1.50), 40c. All prepaid. Address H.M.M., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS—These books all cost \$1.50 each. will sell any one for 75c, prepaid. Paradoxical Pain, *Harbin*; Wall, on Infant Baptism, 2 cloth vols, 700 pp each vol, bargain at \$2.00 set; The Higher Critic's Bible or God's Bible, *Burns*; Steps Unto Heaven, *Carpenter*; Divine Movement in Israel, *Porter*; The Life that Really Is, *Abbott*. Address N.O.P., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

The Six Miracles of Calvary

By

The late Bishop William R. Nicholson

A series of six gripping and illuminating articles
which will appear in the next 6 issues of

MOODY Bible **MONTHLY**
Institute

The first article entitled

The Miraculous Darkness

appears in the November issue.

The beautiful Christmas issue will contain
the second of the series entitled

The Rending of the Veil

*These articles are for the first time offered
to the public and are some of the most spiritually
stimulating and enjoyable articles that we have
ever published.*

They will bring to you some of the most profound
truths centered around the death and resurrection
of our Lord.

The complete series in 6 issues, \$1.00

To Read One Is to Want All!

MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTE MONTHLY, 175 Institute Place, Chicago, Ill.

The Moody Bible Institute Monthly,
175 Institute Place,
Chicago, Ill.

Please enter my subscription for the "Six Miracles of Calvary Series." I enclose \$1.00

Name _____

Address _____

Index

Convicted of Heresy.....	499	Natives of Australia, The.....	130
Day of Fasting and Prayer for China.....	553	New Editors, Our.....	16, 493, 553
Day that Never Came, The.....	7	Notes on the Word Firmament.....	494
Deliverance from Groaning.....	447	Of Interest to our Subscribers.....	605
Distorting Biblical Doctrines.....	72	One Hundred and Twenty-first Psalm.....	189
Does Evolution Hurt Christianity?.....	319	Only Alternative, The.....	547
Editor's Fine Tribute to Champion, An.....	551	Preaching to the Spirits in Prison.....	135
Evangelism.....	448	Preach Righteousness.....	17
Evolution and Religion.....	489	Preach Salvation.....	133
Evolution of Character, The.....	247	Preciousness of the Bible.....	309
Fact of Christ, The.....	496	Pre-existence of Our Lord, The.....	11
Faith and The Faith.....	187	Prince of the Power of the Air, The.....	491
Fatal Compromise, The.....	445	Profound Ethics of the Bible, The.....	446
From Glory to Glory.....	550	Progress? What is.....	249
Grave Protest, A.....	67	Purpose of our Afflictions, The.....	497
Great Affirmations of the Faith.....	15	Quoting from the Modernists.....	448
Heaping Coals of Fire.....	73	Rational Act of Faith, The.....	492
Here is Some Sarcasm.....	16	Saint Paul and Evolution.....	545
Historical Method of Scripture Interpreta- tion.....	137	Science or Speculation?.....	126
Holding Another Religion.....	318	Sign of the Prophet Jonah, The.....	14
How an Atheist Sees Things.....	313	Significant and Encouraging.....	552
Important Survey, An.....	9	Something about Quotations.....	309
Individual and the Race, The.....	488	Some very Doubtful Benefits.....	189
Investment of Personality, The.....	5	Soul's Awakening, The.....	185
Jesus and His Place in the Universe.....	444	Source Hypothesis of the Penteteuch.....	306
Jonah on the Radio.....	131	Spiritual Efficiency.....	127
Keyser's Busy Vacation, Dr.....	401	Take no Thought for the Morrow.....	129
Knowing the Lord at His Coming.....	125	Tears of Jesus, The.....	404
Lamb Slain, The.....	245	Time of Figs not Yet, The.....	549
Let us Stick to Facts.....	310	Worth and Value of the Bible, The.....	305
Life is Everlasting.....	485	Union Through Love.....	134
Light of the Scriptures, The.....	491	Vicarious Principle, The.....	398
Love.....	312	Walking with God.....	546
Man Many People Know, The.....	132	Were Plants and Animals Evolved?.....	191
Modernism become Desperate.....	316	We Want a Bible.....	441
		Which Way is the Tide Moving?.....	68

THE LIBRARY TABLE

And now comes Monogenesis.....	295	Liberal to the Core.....	237
Another Book in the Training Course.....	179	List of Anti-Evolution Books.....	655
Answer and a Challenge, An.....	175	List of Liberalistic Books, A.....	299
Book Re-Reviewed, A.....	119	Luther and Erasmus—Their Debate.....	602
Clear and Definite Meaning of Evolution.....	234	Man Nobody Knows, The.....	116
Commending a Great and Good Book.....	300	One-Man Bible Translations.....	657
Evidence more Con than Pro, the.....	388	Programme of Christianity, The.....	172
Good Books on Biblical Inspiration.....	539	Quotations from Huxley.....	385
Good Tracts on Higher Criticism.....	537	Science Speaks to Osborn.....	58, 110
How Infidels and Modernists Review Books.....	117	Selections from a Good Book.....	600
Immortality of Spiritual Values, The.....	596	Signal Work by Dr. Koenig, A.....	542
Intemperate Advocates of Evolution Re- buked.....	540	Status of Union Seminary, The.....	480
Koenig and the Old Testament Field.....	479	Story of Philosophy, The.....	236
Koenig's Commentary on Isaiah.....	177	Two New Books on Darwin.....	436
		What can we Believe?.....	298

PRAYER MEETING SERVICE

Abiding in Christ.....	530	First Evening, The.....	647
Arrest, The.....	589	First Morning, The.....	647
Bethesda.....	167	Forty Days, The.....	648
Betrayal by Judas.....	475	Future Forecast, The.....	530
Christ Baptising.....	106	Gethsemane.....	589
Christ Hand-Picking Disciples.....	54	God's Judgment and Ours.....	106
Christ in Society.....	54	God the Father and Son.....	130
Christ's Compassion.....	231	Holy Spirit Promised.....	530
Christ's Teaching Misjudged.....	375	In the Beginning was the Word.....	53
Christ Tests Spirituality.....	292	Nicodemus and Christ.....	376
Christ the Bread of Life.....	292	Nobleman of Capernaum.....	167
Christ the Demonstrator of Life.....	432	Peter's Denial.....	474
Christ the Friend in the Home.....	431	Pharasaic Prejudice.....	231
Christ the Idol of the People.....	431	Sabbath, The.....	230
Christ the Messiah.....	377	Samaritan Woman, The.....	166
Christ the Physician.....	377	Second Lord's Day, The.....	648
Christ the Shepherd.....	377	Teachers of Israel, The.....	105
Christ the Substitute.....	431	Temple of Herod, The.....	105
Christ the Truth.....	376	Trial, The.....	589
Crowd of Unbelievers, A.....	474	Unbelieving Brothers.....	292
Crucifixion, The.....	590	Universal Christ, The.....	375
Disciples and the Samaritans, The.....	166	Untracable Christ, The.....	291
Elusive Christ, The.....	375	Witness of John, The.....	53
Farewell Prayer of Jesus.....	531	Wrangling, Jealous Disciples.....	474

Index

THE SANCTUARY

Can we Talk with the Dead?.....	369	New Year, The—A Step in the Ladder.....	47
Defending the Faith.....	101	No More Sea.....	285
Gain through Loss.....	470	Red Trail, The.....	225
God's Companion.....	372	Redemptive Energies	524
Is Life worth Living?.....	163	Religious Positivism	427
Let us give Thanks.....	585		

TEXTS

Genesis	239, 389	Luke 12:20	51	John 19:17-42	589
1:27	372	13:29	373	20:1-18	647
3:15	26	24:27	506	20:17	43
5:24	546	John 1:12	80	20:19-25	647
5:27	163	1:14	614	20:26-31	648
15:13	42	1:1-18	53	20:31	217
27:10-12	47	1:19-34	53	21:1-25	648
Exodus 3:13	207	1:35-51	54	Acts 2:42	252
Joshua 1:8	228	2:1-12	54	7:16	42
Judges 4:14	529	2:13-25	105	10:34	19
Ruth	513	3:1-15	105	15:18	324
1 Samuel 28:7	369	3:11	281	19:8	101
1 Kings 20:1-11	7	3:16	77	20:22	161
2 Kings 7:18-29	51	3:16-21	106	Romans	57
24:8	366	3:22-36	100	1:11	19
Job 42:10	430	4:1-26	166	1:18	545
Psalms 5:4	95	4:27-38	166	2:4	406
8:4,5	323	4:46-54	167	5:8	290
18:46	289	5:1-9	167	6:11	228
103:2-4	585	5:10-18	230	8:7	278
104:24	229	5:19-29	230	8:18	452
116:10	427	5:30-47	231	8:22	447
119:71	497	5:31	94	8:35	473
119:89	449	6:1-15	231	12:20	73
121	189	6:16-40	291	14:7	429
Proverbs 8:26,27	31	6:40	97	15:4	137
22:28	219	6:41-59	291	1 Corinthians 1:23	133
25:21,22	73	6:60-71	292	3:11	407
Isaiah	177	7:1-9	292	3:11-15	422
7:14	11	7:10-24	375	7:10	160
28:20	529	7:25-36	375	9:27	97
29:14	283	7:37-44	375	2 Corinthians 1:3,4	365
45:7	95	7:45-52	376	3:4,5	500
49:15	229	8:31-59	377	3:18	430, 550
50:4	500	8:46	397	4:13	427
53:4	373	9:1-41	377	4:17	250
53:5	398	10:1-21	377	5:1	250
55:6	290	10:22-42	377	12:7	587
66:13	228	11:35	404	12:10	528
Daniel 12:3	104	11:43	528	13	312
Jonah	14, 181	11:47-53	431	Galatians 1:15	444
Zechariah 9:11,12	588	12:1-11	431	6:14	588
Matthew 1:18	642	12:12-19	431	Ephesians 2:2	491
3:16	52	12:20-36	432	Philippians 3:7	470
6:34	129	12:37-50	474	3:12	529
8:3	229	13:1-20	474	Colossians 1:15	502
9:35	374	13:21-35	475	2 Timothy 3:16	502
11:3	473	13:36-38	475	4:7	554
12:39-41	78	14:1-31	530	Hebrews 2:14,15	402
16:16	472	14:6	290	James 4:13-16	7
17:1,2	430	14:8	587	1 Peter 1:13,18,19	524
18:5	472	15:1-27	530	3:18-20	135
19:30	104	15:16	32	1 John 1:7	104
24:21-27	125	16:1-33	530	1:8	38
25:40	512	16:32	374	2:3	132
26:40	51	16:33	531	3:8	38
27:37	160	17:24	451	Revelation 3:11	429
27:43	457	18:1	589	13:8	225, 245, 332
Mark 11:13	549	18:2-14	589	21:1	285
Luke 2:11	606	18:19-19:16	589		
3:23	423	19:14	43		